

BERROWS WORCESTER JOURNAL
1861 to 1869

1 January 5 1861

WORCESTERSHIRE EPIPHANY SESSIONS

FELONY AT HALESOWEN **John Wiggett**, charged with stealing a pair of boots, the property of **James Stephens**, was found guilty and sentenced to six months' hard labour. Mr Griffiths for prosecution. The robbery took place in a boat, both prosecutor and prisoner being boatmen.

PLEADED GUILTY **Edward Holden**, 20, boatman, pleaded guilty to stealing a horse collar on the 18th November last at Halesowen, the property of Thomas Pensland. He also pleaded guilty to having been twice previously convicted. He was sentenced to four years' penal servitude.

2 January 5 1861

PLEASING TESTIMONIAL The Rev W H Lloyd, curate of St Clement's, being about to leave this city, and consequently the care of the Watermen's Church, the members and friends of that place of worship, with which Mr Lloyd's labours were principally connected, have determined upon presenting him with a testimonial of their esteem for him, and a recognition of the satisfactory manner in which his ministerial duties have been performed. Accordingly a very handsome silver pocket Communion service in the Etruscan pattern has been selected from the stock of Mr J M Skarratt, jeweller of Broad Street, which is intended to be presented to him at a tea meeting to be held this (Friday) evening. It bears the following inscription :- "Presented to the Rev W H Lloyd MA by the friends and members of the Watermen's Church, Worcester, 4th January 1861".

3 January 12 1861

THE WEATHER Another week of intensely cold weather has been experienced in this locality, which reminds one of the winters of olden time, though no living person can cite an instance within his memory when such a scene was exhibited upon Pitchcroft as has been patent during the past week. Skates have been at a premium, and it is no great risk to affirm that the skate makers were never so busy as they are at present, and perhaps they never will be so again. Not a day has elapsed without this meadow being visited by crowds of citizens who have made it what it never was before, a fashionable place of winter resort. No difference was made between week days and Sunday, except that on Sunday there was a larger crowd present, and it was calculated that there were 6,000 persons on the ground at one time during the afternoon, and in the course of the day at least 15,000 persons must have been on the race course. The skaters were very numerous, and refreshments such as beer and tea and coffee were in liberal supply and demand. But it was at night the scene was of the most exciting character, for tar barrels were lighted and candles subscribed for that the skaters might keep clear of the holes, and by these fitful and unusual lights, skating was kept up till a late hour. It may also be mentioned that several attempts were made to fabricate sleighs, which pleased their occupants, though they were deficient in all the peculiarities of the Canadian sleigh. The "games" got up by the skaters have comprised waltzing, racing, steeple chasing, &c, and one favourite night sport has consisted in a band of 20 or 30 skaters following a leader bearing a torch, who conducts them over a course swept for the purpose, a chase of several miles in length, in the course of which a ditch, where the ice has fallen in, is crossed several times, and here is the most exciting part of the chase, as if the skater is not very firm upon his "pins", he is doomed to "come to grief", to the delectation of the onlookers. Torches are used in endless numbers, and at various parts the fires and other illuminations, the flaunting Union Jack and tricolour, together with the gruff voices of the vendors of "torches, gen'lmen" give the scene the appearance of a fair. With all this going on, it is gratifying to state that not a single accident of a serious nature has occurred, though of course the "bumps" have been numerous, and bruises are the rule. At the Arboretum in Sansome Walk, there is also a fine sheet of ice, which commands a fair share of patrons. In many other places similar proceedings are going on, of which Tewkesbury and

Gloucester may be cited as examples. In London also the skating on the ornamental waters in the parks has been carried on to an extent scarcely ever known before, and the same remark applies to the country generally. As might be expected, some accidents have occurred, though they have not been very disastrous in this locality. The cold has been most intense in Yorkshire and in Scotland ; an Aberdeen paper states that a thermometer marked 19 degrees below zero, or adding 19 to 32, the freezing point, showing a temperature of 51 degrees under the point at which water freezes! That the cold this season has scarcely been equalled is certainly true, but there are sources of errors that *minimum* thermometers are liable to, and it may be to a deranged instrument that we should attribute some of the extreme readings that have been noted. Many birds have been picked up literally starved to death, and most of the finch and thrush species are becoming very tame, while robins seek human dwellings and gladly avail themselves of the hospitality of man. We have heard of four or five of these birds taking refuge in a house, and roosting upon the furniture, or Christmas holly sprigs used to decorate the windows. The severe weather has put a stop to the building and other trades, and frozen out boatmen and gardeners have sought a means of subsistence by habiting themselves as Morris dancers, and capering for the public amusement in the streets. The thermometer has, during the last two or three days, ranged higher than in the beginning of the week, and yesterday and today has been only two or three degrees above the freezing point. This afternoon a thaw has set in.

4 January 12 1861

MURDER A murder has been committed near Erith. The body of a bargeman named **William Munns**, who resided at a locality chiefly inhabited by brickmakers and known as Botany Bay, near the village of Erith, was found in a ditch near the brickfields. His head and face were much cut and bruised. Within a few yards of the ditch, on the ground, which was frozen over, was a quantity of blood and hair, and appearances of a severe struggle, the hair exactly corresponding with that on the head of deceased. It was found that the deceased had been in company with a man of the same class named **James Jeffries** on the previous night at a public house. Both men left the house together about eleven o'clock, and shortly afterwards they were heard to be quarrelling. Jeffries has been apprehended and remanded.

5 February 2 1861

NARROW ESCAPE FROM DROWNING William Hill, a market gardener of Upton-on-Severn, had a narrow escape from drowning on Monday night. He had visited this city on business, and proceeded to return at dusk in the evening, but instead of taking the Gloucester road, in his drunkenness, he walked down Diglis Street and by some means or other got into the Severn. Between seven and eight o'clock, two young watermen named **William Owens** and **William English**, when coming from Diglis, saw what they believed to be a hat on the water, and pushed off in a fishing boat towards it. They then saw it was a man standing in an upright position in the river, and all but drowned. With some difficulty they dragged him ashore, and conveyed him to the house of a fisherman named John Jenkins in Diglis Street, where restoratives were applied, and Mr Jones, surgeon, was sent for, and happily by care and attention his life was saved, although consciousness did not return until an early hour next morning. He had no recollection of his adventure, nor any idea of having so narrowly escaped with his life. His generosity did not lead him to recompense either his deliverers or the poor people in whose house he was lodged, as on his departure next morning, he asked the Jenkins's if they would accept a sixpence for their trouble! This they refused, and this considerate individual walked away with £1 16s 1d in his pocket which, with his life, had been saved for him.

6 March 1 1862

DEATH OF A BOATMAN An inquest was held at the Navigation Inn, Lowesmoor, on Tuesday last, before R T Rea Esq, coroner, to enquire into the circumstances attending the death of **Thomas Brace**, aged 46, a boatman, who died the previous day. The deceased, who for some time had

suffered from asthma was, up to the time of his decease, in the employ of Mr T Sewell, coal merchant of the Blockhouse, and last week complained of a difficulty in breathing. On Wednesday the 19th, he went to Netherton with his master's boat for a load of coal, and on Friday he became very ill. On Saturday he was returning to Worcester, when he was struck with paralysis. A boatman who was with him, named **Allen**, obtained medical aid for him at Kingsnorton, and on Sunday morning deceased started for this city, where he arrived about twelve the same night, but died in the course of an hour and a half. The jury returned a verdict of "Died by the visitation of God". Deceased left a wife and large family unprovided for.

7 March 8 1862

CITY POLICE

THREATS **Thomas Penny**, a boatman, who had been disorderly in Broad Street, was bound over to keep the peace towards PC Hill.

8 March 22 1862

CITY POLICE

CHARGE OF STEALING FROM THE PERSON **Mary Wilton**, described as a married woman, was charged with stealing 14s from the person of **William Rawlins**, boatman. The evidence was very slight against the prisoner. The prosecutor was drinking at the Crown in Friar Street on the previous night, and got drunk, falling down in that state in the yard at the back of the house. Whilst in that situation, he lost his money, and his suspicion fell upon the prisoner, who was a lodger in the house, because it happened that she had gone into the yard during the time he was lying there. She was discharged.

ASSAULT **Philip Langford**, boatman, was brought up charged with an assault on another boatman named **Ricketts**. The latter did not appear, but according to the statements of PC Franklin and a boy who was a witness of the assault, the prisoner on Saturday afternoon followed Ricketts up the canal, and at the back of the Arboretum knocked him down and beat him until he was covered with blood. Some persons interfered, and the prisoner on going away was taken into custody by PC Franklin in Sansome Walk. Ricketts said he had been robbed of 3s 6d as well as beaten, and it was believed that his non-attendance today was attributable to fear. Prisoner had no defence further than he was so drunk that he did not know what he was doing. The Magistrates remarked that he was not too drunk to fight, and as he had been there before for drunkenness, they should fine him 5s with 3s 6d expenses, in default seven days' imprisonment with hard labour. He was also cautioned as to his violence, and informed that if Ricketts had appeared, the Bench would have committed him (prisoner) for trial.

9 April 26 1862

CITY POLICE

ASSAULT ON A CONSTABLE **John Brace** and **William Jones**, boatmen, were charged with an assault on PC Vine. On the afternoon of Sunday week, the officer went into the West Midland Arms, Lowesmoor, and found the prisoners and other men there. He put his hand upon Brace's shoulder to turn him round, with a view to ascertain if he had put any beer behind him, when Brace struck him. Jones then followed the example, and Brace pursued the officer into the street, and repeated the assault. They then got away, and were since apprehended on a warrant. A couple of witnesses and the landlord corroborated the complainant's statement, and prisoners were convicted, Jones declaring that he had done nothing. Brace was fined £5 with expenses, in default twenty one days' imprisonment ; Jones £2 with expenses, in default fourteen days' imprisonment, each with hard labour. Mr Williams, landlord of the West Midland Arms, was then charged with an offence against his license by allowing the men to be in his house on the Sunday named, but as he had voluntarily given evidence for the police in the former case, the charge was not pressed. He said they got into his house while he was out of the way.

10 May 3 1862

DUDLEY

THE ROBBERY FROM THE WEST MIDLAND RAILWAY On Monday, **Edward Lloyd**, a boatman, was again brought up on remand, charged with having been concerned in a robbery of leather and silk, to the value of £37, the property of the West Midland Railway Company. Mr Bentley of Worcester appeared for the prosecution, and Mr Warmington for the defence. James Carter, residing at Rotheram, and carrying on business as a leather merchant in partnership with William McCallam, said that on the 25th of June 1861, he selected two dozen of kipp butts for a customer named Fieldhouse of Wolverhampton. The goods were given to a servant named Thomas Harrison to pack up. The leather produced by Superintendent Burton and Police-sergeant Davis he could swear to, as it bore his private mark. It weighed 86 lbs. Thomas Harrison deposed to having packed up the leather in question in the canvas bag produced by Police-sergeant Davis, and to delivering it to Messrs Pickford and Co's carter, a man named Simpson. Simpson was then called to prove the delivery of the goods to the railway station, and several other witnesses were formally called to prove the transit of the goods from one place to another previous to their arrival at Dudley station, where it was alleged the robbery took place. Superintendent Burton then deposed to having, in company with Police-sergeant Davis, found the prisoner and another man (since dead) at Holly Hall, between five and six o'clock on the morning of the 27th of June last. They had a bag each, containing something bulky. Witness apprehended the prisoner, and in his bag found the three pieces of stuff and twelve pieces of leather produced. He did not ascertain all the facts connected with this case until the prisoner and his companion, a man named Aston, had been convicted of another robbery from the London and North Western Railway. For that offence they were both sentenced to nine months' imprisonment. Aston died in gaol, and prisoner was apprehended on this charge, on witness's application, immediately after his release from imprisonment for the first offence. Police-sergeant Davis corroborated Superintendent Burton's evidence, and went on to say that he looked into the bag which Aston had, and found it to contain the leather produced. The prisoner reserved his defence and, being unable to satisfactorily account for his possession of the stolen property, was fully committed for trial at the next quarter sessions at Worcester. There was a second charge against the prisoner of being concerned in stealing silk or alpaca cloth, consigned at the same time as the leather and, the evidence being materially the same as in the last case, he was committed for trial on this charge also. Bail was agreed to be accepted, prisoner in £200 and two sureties in £100 each ; but, not being forthcoming, prisoner was locked up.

11 May 17 1862

DROITWICH

DESERTING A FAMILY Yesterday at the Borough Petty Sessions, before Thomas Tomkins Esq, **Daniel Allen** of this place, boatman, was brought up in custody of PS Harris charged with running away from his two children, whereby they had become chargeable to the Droitwich Union, at a cost of £1 2s 11d. Prisoner refused to pay the amount due, and also told the magistrate that he would never pay anything for his children's support. Committed for three weeks' hard labour.

12 June 21 1862

CITY POLICE

GEESE STEALING **D Allen**, boatman, was brought up on suspicion of stealing two geese. He was found by the police hawking them for sale between seven and eight o'clock this morning, wrapped up in a frock. They were quite warm and bleeding, having been killed by knocking their heads against a stone. He asked 2s each for the birds, and said he gave that for them to two boatmen, and did not want to make "much profit". One is a white one and the other is grey. It is expected that they were stolen either from Kempsey or Tibberton. On being asked if he did not live at Tewkesbury, he said, "No, I do not live anywhere". (Laughter). He then repeated the story about buying them, and was remanded till Monday, to allow the police to make inquiries. He said, "Why the geese will stink by then".

13 June 28 1862

FATAL ACCIDENT On Saturday afternoon, a man named **William Roberts** (boatman) was proceeding along the Birmingham Canal, Netherton, when the boat came in contact with a bridge buttress, and deceased was consequently thrown off and terribly crushed between the side of the boat and the towing-path. The injuries proved fatal, and he died the same day.

14 July 26 1862

STOURPORT MAGISTRATES' OFFICE, WEDNESDAY JULY 23

FELONY **Moses Gough**, a boatman, was charged with stealing seven brushes, value 4s 6d, from a travelling shop belonging to William James, on the 20th instant. The brushes and other things were hanging round the van or travelling shop, and while it was halting outside the White Lion Hotel, Gough was seen by a little boy named Allen Goode to take the brushes and throw them into the boat on the canal close at hand. Information was given to PC Ingham who, in company with James, searched the boat and found the brushes, and took Gough into custody. Gough, in defence, stated he was drunk and knew nothing about it. He was sentenced to two months' hard labour.

15 July 26 1862

WORCESTER CITY AND COUNTY SUMMER ASSIZES

CROWN COURT

ATTEMPTED BURGLARY AT NORTHFIELD **William Vaughan**, 23, waterman, was indicted for breaking into the dwelling house of George Sanders on the 3rd of April last at Northfield, and stealing a window blind.

Mr Chance prosecuted, the prisoner was undefended.

The prosecutor was awoke in the night by hearing a noise, and on going to the window and asking who was there, the prisoner said, "It is me, and I want to come and sleep here". On this the prosecutor went downstairs and found the shutter's spring broken and unfastened, and a window blind gone. The prisoner ran away with the blind in his hand. He was drunk. Guilty. A previous conviction was proved against him, and he was sentenced to two months' imprisonment with hard labour.

CITY CASES

THE BURGLARY AT MR GRAINGER'S **Henry Harman**, 41, boatman, and Candia Munn, 46, married woman, were indicted for burglariously breaking and entering the dwelling house of Joseph Grainger, and stealing therefrom 50 lbs of tea, on the 24th or 25th March last. The prisoners were also indicted for receiving the tea, knowing it to have been stolen.

Mr Best prosecuted. Mr Motteram defended Harman, and Mr Richards appeared for Munn.

Emma Clee, a servant formerly in the service of the prosecutor, stated that on the night of the 24th March, Mr Grainger's house was safely locked up. She went downstairs about seven the next morning, when she found the kitchen door standing open. A pane of glass had been broken in order to get at the fastenings of the window. There were 16 or 17 empty tea canisters in the kitchen, the contents of which had been taken.

William Holland, shopman to prosecutor, stated that on the night previous to the burglary there were about 80 or 90 lbs of tea in the canisters. They were of all kinds : some were mixed and some were unmixed. Mr Grainger sent the tea to the shop from his other shop in High Street.

Mr Joseph Grainger, the prosecutor, stated that on the 24th March last he had Moning Congou, Kainow Congou, plain and orange pekoe scented and orange pekoe, Canton and souchong, gunpowder, small leaf gunpowder (fine), Canton ditto, hyson, young hyson and other sorts of tea at his shop. Produced some samples of the tea he had received from PC Fowkes.

PC Fowkes said : On the 26th of March last he went to Harman's house in Hylton Street, and after searching it, found in the bedroom, concealed in a jar, about 8 lbs of tea. Harman said he bought it from a man at Brierley Hill, who was selling it by auction. Witness told him he had every reason to believe that the tea was part of that stolen from Mr Grainger's, and that he should take him into

custody on suspicion. The next morning, witness gave Mr Grainger about one pound and a half of it.

The prosecutor was here recalled. He identified some of the tea produced. It was a peculiar mixture and was made up of Congou, Orange scented Pekoe, fine and small Canton, gunpowder and hyson of two kinds. It was by the mixture witness identified the tea as his. No grocer would have mixed such teas.

Cross-examined by Mr Motteram : Tea was sent up every week from the High Street shop to the shop in the Tything, where the tea was stolen from. A jar might be a very good thing to keep tea in. Should not think a stocking would be a good thing to keep the air out from the tea. The teas produced were common enough, except the young Hyson, which was uncommon fine.

By the Judge : The most expensive tea was the fine gunpowder, which was 6s per lb. Some of the tea in the mixture was not worth more than 3s or 2s 8d.

PS Drew was here called, and said he searched Munn's house on the 25th April last, but found nothing. On the 6th May he searched it again, and found in the shop window two small canisters of tea. He asked her where she had the tea from, and she said that it came while she was in prison. Witness put his hand in the jar and found that the tea smelt smoky, as if it had been placed in the chimney.

Cross-examined by Mr Richards : Candia Munn was in gaol up to the 3rd of May. Sarah Ann Wall, her daughter, had served in the shop whilst she was away.

His Lordship to Mr Best : Have you any other evidence against Candia Munn?

Mr Best : No, my lord.

His Lordship : If you cannot carry the case further against her, she must be discharged. After the evidence of the policeman Drew, it is clear that the tea was taken to her house during the time she was in gaol, therefore it is quite evident that she cannot be charged with feloniously receiving it.

By the direction of the learned Judge, the Jury then discharged the prisoner Candia Munn.

Mr Motteram, in addressing the Jury for the other prisoner, contended that the identity of the tea had not been made out satisfactorily, and that there was nothing to show that the prisoner Harman had become dishonestly possessed of it.

The learned Judge having carefully summed up, the jury found the prisoner guilty of receiving.

In reply to the Judge, Sergeant Drew said he had frequently been after the prisoner for petty thefts.

His Lordship said, had the jury found the prisoner guilty of the burglary, he would have had to undergo a long sentence of penal servitude, but as it was, the sentence upon him was that he be kept in prison with hard labour for the space of eight months.

16 August 9 1862

WATCH COMMITTEE The Superintendent reported that some time ago, he brought the case of a boatman named **Noah Dayus** before the Council of the Royal Humane Society, Dayus having very gallantly rescued a woman who attempted self destruction in the canal. That morning he (the Superintendent) had received a communication from the Society, forwarding for presentation to Dayus the thanks of the Society written on vellum. Some conversation followed, in the course of which Mr Alderman Hill drew attention to the defective nature of the drags at present in use, and the necessity there was for putting them in good repair or providing others in their place. Mr Alderman Haigh concurred.

17 August 16 1862

CITY POLICE

CHARGE OF ATTEMPTING TO PICK POCKETS William Oakley, a suspicious looking character, was charged with attempting to pick the pockets of a boatman named **Smith**. PS Holmes said that on Monday evening he was informed that there was a row at the Hole In The Wall public house, and he proceeded there in company with PC Young. Upon arriving there, Smith said the prisoner had tried to pick his pocket several times. He was then taken into custody. It appearing that the prosecutor Smith had been obliged to go up the canal with a boat, and would not be back

before Sunday, the prisoner was remanded until Monday.

18 August 23 1862

INQUEST On Monday last, an inquest was held before Mr Rea, City Coroner, at the Anchor Public House, Diglis, touching the death of **James Price**, nine years old, son of **James Price** of Diglis Street, waterman. **Henry Bevan** of Lich Street, boatman, deposed that on Saturday he was preparing a boat to load with timber on Diglis Wharf, and the deceased and two little boys were playing about the boats. He saw the deceased for the last time about half past eleven o'clock in the morning. He was then alive, and was throwing bits of stick towards the boat. His father was captain of the boat, and witness was helping. Deceased's father was at the bottom of the boat getting out the planks to make way for the timber. Price first missed the child, and entertained fears that he had fallen into the water. A search was at once instituted, and the body of the deceased was pulled out of the water ten minutes after witness last saw him alive. He was dead. Verdict : "Accidentally drowned"

19 August 23 1862

CITY POLICE

ATTEMPTING TO PICK POCKETS William Oakley, a stranger to the town, was charged with attempting to pick the pockets of **George Smith**, waterman, in the Hole In The Wall on Thursday night. There had been a chaffing transaction about a smock frock, which terminated in a fight. During the progress of the row, prisoner, as alleged, got his hand into Smith's pocket, but was detected before he found anything. In defence he declared he never touched the man's pocket, and would never again go into a public house. He was discharged on a promise to leave the city forthwith.

20 January 3 1863

CITY POLICE

STEALING A BOAT LINE **John Smith**, a boatman's boy of Hylton Street, was charged with stealing a boat line, the property of a boat owner named Brooks. On Saturday last the rope was left lying in Mr Brook's boat, which was moored off the Quay near Hylton Street, and later in the day it was stolen by the prisoner, who lived in Hylton Street, and who sold it at Jones's, the marine store dealer of All Saint's, the same evening. Nearly 90 lbs had been stolen, but only about 38 lbs had been recovered. Prisoner was apprehended at Ombersley by the county police, and handed over to the charge of PC Young of the city force, to whom he admitted stealing the rope, saying that he should not have done so only his uncle refused to give him any money. The case was further remanded to Tuesday.

STEALING FROM A BOAT **Charles Cull**, a boat boy, Birmingham, was brought up charged with stealing a piece of rope, value 2s, belonging to his master, a boatman named Brooks. Prisoner, stating that he could produce witnesses to contradict the evidence given by the persons to whom he sold the rope, was allowed to send for a boy named Harris to prove his assertion. On coming up, Harris completely contradicted prisoner's statement, who was committed for two months with hard labour.

21 January 10 1863

BEWDLEY

FOWL STEALING On Saturday last, information was given to Superintendent Maynard that several fowls had been stolen from Mr Griffin's, of the Fox Inn in this town. On Sunday he was further informed that a man had been seen carrying a bundle through the Welch gate. Acting upon this slight information, the same day about two in the afternoon, he entered a house in Welch gate occupied by William Onslow, and there found two fowls just cooked, and placed upon the table for dinner. The remainder of the stolen fowls, not plucked, were secreted on the same premises.

During the day, two of the depredators, John Ullman, shoemaker, Welch gate, and **William Hurst**, boatmen, Severn Side, both bad characters, were apprehended. They were taken before the magistrates on Monday and remanded for a week, to give Maynard an opportunity of capturing another person connected with the robbery.

22 January 10 1863

CITY SESSIONS

ANOTHER CASE OF STEALING A WATCH FROM THE PERSON James Phillips, 32, rat catcher (a ticket of leave) was indicted for stealing a silver watch, the property of **James Bowkett**, on the 12th December last. Mr Godson prosecuted. The prosecutor is a boatman living at Ledbury, and on the night of the above day he was in Worcester, and got intoxicated. Whilst in that state he was robbed of his watch, which the next evening was sold by the prisoner for 18s to one Prosser, a hallier. When he sold the watch, prisoner said it had been his father's. He was found guilty, and pleaded guilty to a previous conviction in 1858, when he was sentenced to four years' penal servitude. The Deputy Recorder, in sentencing the prisoner, said that when he was sentenced to four years' penal servitude by him (the Deputy Recorder), he had been previously convicted six times. Prisoner was then sentenced to six years' penal servitude.

23 February 14 1863

CITY POLICE

STEALING COAL George and Henry Freeman, two brothers living in Lowesmoor, and described as jobbers in coal, were charged, the first named with having stolen and the latter with feloniously receiving, 11 cwt of coal, the property of Mr E Lane of St John's, from the wharf at Lowesmoor. Mr Clutterbuck appeared for the defence. A witness named **William Lea**, boatman employed by Mr Lane, deposed that about two o'clock on Friday afternoon he was going up Lowesmoor wharf when he saw George Freeman and another man loading coal from a stack belonging to Mr Lane upon the wharf. Witness asked Freeman who he worked for, and the prisoner replied for Mr White. He (Lea) told the prisoner it was not Mr White's coal but Mr Lane's, upon which Freeman and the other man discontinued loading the cart, which was then about half full. Freeman at the time stated that he thought the coal was Mr White's, for whom he was employed to load. Henry Freeman was not present. All that he (Lea) saw George Freeman remove from Mr Lane's stack were a few pieces. Mr White had a stack of coal on the wharf about three boat lengths from Mr Lane's. In cross-examination the witness said immediately on his telling George Freeman that it was Mr Lane's coal, he discontinued loading, and left the cart where it was on the wharf. Henry and George were not together at the coal. There was no horse in the cart. It was Jacob Daniel's cart. **Benjamin Pope**, watchman on Lowesmoor wharf, said that after the coal had been taken, he gave information to PC Wall, and afterwards saw the two prisoners on the wharf. He asked George Freeman what he took the coal for, and Freeman said, "What odds ; I was going to pay for it". He (Pope) said he should have asked Mr Lane first. Henry then told George to go up to Mr Lane and pay for it. He did not seem inclined to go, but shuffled about, and he (Pope) then took hold of him. He wrestled, got away, and ran into Pheasant Street. Witness overtook him there, and he then said to his brother, "You know how to do it ; go up to Lane's and pay for the coal". PCs Wall and Rudniski then came up, and he gave George Freeman into custody. Henry Freeman got away. When George was taken into custody he desired to be released, saying he had done nothing, and that he only run away from the watchman to go to Mr Lane's and pay for the coal. Other evidence was adduced to prove that the prisoners had no right to take the coal, and that the value of the quantity found in the cart was 7s 6d. Mr Clutterbuck contended that on the part of George Freeman there was no felonious intent proved, but on the contrary, a readiness to pay for the coal, and that in the case of the other prisoner, no case whatever had been made out. The Magistrates concurred as to Henry Freeman, and discharged him. Upon being asked whether he would plead guilty and be sentenced at once, George Freeman replied in the affirmative, and was sentenced to three months' hard labour. Mr Sidebottom said he was sorry there was no sufficient or proper protection for the coal on the wharf.

24 March 7 1863

SELLING A WIFE A disgusting exhibition of this kind took place at Cardiff last week. According to the local papers, two men named **Dugmore** and **Phillips** went into a public house for the purpose of disposing of Dugmore's better half. Dugmore, who had a family of five children and followed the occupation of a boatman, had determined to dispose of his wife to Phillips for the nominal amount of one shilling, and to take to another woman, who had been deserted by her husband, with two children. Phillips, a boatman and a widower, with five children also, agreed to take to Mrs Dugmore, and paid the shilling for her, and took to one of Dugmore's children, to have half a dozen each and to "make it more agreeable". A Mr Jenkins being called in, made out the agreement, which was signed in his presence. After all the preliminaries had been gone through, a jovial evening was spent.

25 March 7 1863

BEWDLEY

FOUND DROWNED The body of a little boy seven years old was taken out of the Severn on Tuesday by a boatman named **Priest**. An inquest was held by Mr Best for Mr W S P Hughes on Thursday, at the Saracen's Head, where the body was taken to, when it was identified by Samuel Jordan of Bridgnorth, the father of the deceased, who said his son was supposed to have fallen into the Severn on the 19th January last, when he was missed. He had no reason to suppose he had come to his death by unfair means. Mr C Webster, surgeon of Bewdley, said from the length of time deceased had been in the water, the body was in a very decomposed state, but he could see no marks of violence. Verdict : "Accidentally drowned".

26 March 28 1863

RAILWAY ROBBERY On Saturday, **Thomas Robinson**, a boatman, was charged at West Bromwich with stealing five dozen deerstalkers and other hats from a goods train on the West Midland Railway. They were sent from Leicester to Mr Grainger of Kidderminster, and the chest containing them was missed at Dudley. Prisoner had disposed of the goods, and was committed for trial. Mr Bentley of this city conducted the prosecution.

27 April 11 1863

WORCESTERSHIRE EASTER SESSIONS

STEALING LEATHER AT DUDLEY **Joseph Jackson**, 39, **Thomas Gould**, 18 and **William Wheeler**, 35, boatmen, were placed on their trial for having, on the 18th March last at Dudley, stolen five butts of leather, the property of the London and North Western Railway Company. Mr Streeten was for the prosecution. While the leather was in the course of transmission from Mr Cousin, tanner of Stourbridge to Mr Willis, boot manufacturer of Worcester, it was stolen from the Railway Company, and was afterwards found in the possession of the prisoners by Superintendent Burton and PC Minchin. In the course of the trial, it was stated that more than £50 worth of goods had been stolen from the Dudley Railway Station and sidings during the last three or four months. The two men Wheeler and Jackson were sentenced to twelve months' imprisonment with hard labour, the other man to six months with hard labour.

28 April 11 1863

DROITWICH

SUMMARY EJECTMENT **Thomas Wall**, boatman, was charged with assaulting **John Shelley**, boatman. It appeared that complainant had been working a boat for defendant's mother, with whom he had fell out, and she was determined to get rid of him but a dispute had arisen about his wages, and complainant refused to leave the boat, which was lying in the basin, until he was paid 15s extra pay. Defendant, however, went to the boat at eleven o'clock on Saturday night last, and turned defendant (*sic*) and his wife out of bed, and ejected them from the boat. The Bench did not agree with this summary mode of proceeding and fined defendant, including costs, 12s 6d. The amount

was paid.

29 April 1863

CITY POLICE

A RESPECTABLE FAMILY John Spink, labourer, was charged with stealing some bed cloths, the property of Mary Packman, and **George Small**, a boatman, was charged with stealing a chemise and other articles of wearing apparel from the same woman. The prosecutrix said she was the wife of Packman, the greengrocer of St Nicholas Street, but that she had been separated from her husband for many years, and now lived in St Clement's. Small was her brother, and Spink had lived with her as her husband for three years past, during which time he had been very kind to her and her child. The Bench asked her whether Spink or Packman was the father of the child. She said neither of them, but a man whom she knew before she lived with Spink. She then went on to say that the prisoners stole the things before mentioned on Friday, and was proceeding with her story when the Bench told her she had no case, as the property she had been robbed of belonged to her husband. The case was then dismissed, but the prisoners were severely censured and strongly cautioned as to their future doings.

30 May 16 1863

STOURPORT

FOUND DROWNED About ten o'clock on Sunday morning the dead body of **William Friar**, a boatman, was found drowned in one of the canal basins. He was last seen alive about midnight on Saturday. An inquest was held at the Tontine Inn before W S P Hughes Esq, coroner, on Wednesday. **William Kingscote**, captain of the trow called the *Leader* belonging to Danks, Venn and Sanders, stated that deceased was one of the men who worked the vessel. On Saturday night last at twelve o'clock, he and deceased and several others went together towards the vessel, which was lying in dock. Witness let deceased through the lock gates to go on board his vessel for the night, and locked the gates, and witness then went with the captain of another vessel to sleep on board his vessel with him. Deceased was not drunk, but was not quite sober. There was no one else with the vessel but deceased and witness. On Sunday morning witness went to the vessel about eleven o'clock, and then saw deceased in the water, standing nearly upright close to the vessel, and between it and the wall. Deceased's hat was found on the deck of the vessel, and it is surmised he must have gone on board the vessel and staggered and fell into the water. There was a mark at the back of the ear no doubt occasioned by the fall. There was no other evidence offered, and the jury returned a verdict of "Found drowned". Deceased, who was 48 years old, leaves a widow and four or five children.

31 May 16 1863

CITY POLICE

FURIOUS RIDING Herbert Bartley, a smart lad in the employ of Mr George Day, horse breaker, was charged by PC Vine with riding a horse in the Henwick Road at a furious pace. The officer stated that on the afternoon of Monday the 4th inst, he saw the defendant riding a horse at a furious pace through the Lower Henwick Road. Defendant did not attempt to deny the allegation, but said that on the day in question there was a race between two boatmen's horses, for £10 a side, and that he was employed as jockey for one of the horses. The names of the boatmen were **Frederick Smith** and **John Evans**, and the horses were called Harry Long Legs and Jack o'Bones. (Laughter). The chairman asked what the ages of the horses were. Defendant said one was about five years and the other fourteen. (Laughter). He (defendant) rode one and a man named Prosser the other horse. The chairman asked who handicapped them, and whether defendant's horse carried extra weight. Defendant said no one handicapped them, and that his horse did not carry extra weight. In reply to a further question, it appeared that the jockeys rode in colours, for Prosser rode without a coat or a waistcoat, and in his shirt sleeves, whilst the defendant was in his shirt sleeves and waistcoat. The distance it seemed was from the Red Lion at Holt to the Chequers in Cripplegate (about four miles),

and the time was about 25 minutes. (Laughter). Defendant said he rode the losing horse, and that he was to have received 5s, but only got 4s 3d. The case was adjourned till Friday, the Bench ordering that the man Prosser should also appear before them on that day.

32 May 23 1863

CITY POLICE

A BRUTE **George Taylor**, a boatman residing in Pheasant Street, was charged with assaulting his mother on Monday last. Mrs Taylor said that her son had been in the habit of beating her because she could not get him things that he wanted. He did so on Monday, and also on the previous Friday and Saturday. He had been convicted about two years ago and had been imprisoned for three months for assaulting her. When asked what defence he had to make, the unfilial defendant shed some "crocodile tears" and asked to be forgiven, promising that if the magistrate would look over it to behave better for the future. He was committed for three weeks to hard labour, and at the expiration of the time to enter into his own recognisance to keep the peace for such time as the Bench shall think fit.

33 June 20 1863

CLEOBURY MORTIMER PETTY SESSIONS JUNE 13

ROBBERY BY BOATMEN Three boatmen named **Taylor, Bradley** and **Norwood** were charged with stealing a quantity of rope, the property of Messrs Brassey and Field, the railway contractors. Mr Burbury of Bewdley appeared for the prosecution. It appeared from the evidence that the three prisoners were taking a canal boat up the Severn from Bewdley to Bridgnorth, and when passing through some of the works that are at present in course of construction on the line between Bewdley and Tenbury, they took a quantity of rope from a barge moored there by the servants of Messrs Brassey and Field. The rope having been missed, information was given to the police, and on the arrival of the prisoners at Bridgnorth, the county police searched the boat and found the rope which had been stolen. The prisoners were committed for trial.

34 June 27 1863

CITY POLICE

A RUFFIAN **John Brace**, a boatman, was charged with a violent assault on a young woman named Emma Lemm, and with using threats towards PCs Stringer and Rudninzki. About twelve o'clock on the previous night, Stringer was called into a house in Quay Street, where defendant and the woman lived, defendant having attacked her in a most brutal manner, aiming a blow at her with a poker. The blow fortunately did not take effect, or probably it would have killed the woman, for the force used was so great that a piece of the table against which the poker came in contact was broken clean off. When Stringer went in, defendant had hold of the woman by the hair of her head, and when she gave him in charge, the ruffian swore he would knock the officer's brains out, at the same time making a blow at him with the poker. He was taken into custody, and with the assistance of PC Rudninzki was removed to the station, where it was found that he had the poker secreted about him. The woman of course said she "did not wish to harm" defendant, and would not prosecute, but the magistrate committed him for 14 days with hard labour, ordering him to find sureties to be of good behaviour at the expiration of that time.

35 June 27 1863

COUNTY PETTY SESSIONS

ROBBERY AT OMBERSLEY William Davis, a soldierly looking man, apparently a deserter from the army, was charged with stealing a waistcoat and a neck tie, the property of Samuel Insole, at Ombersley on the 11th instant. The prosecutor, a labourer, lived at the Wharf Inn, Holt Fleet, and on the above day left the waistcoat and tie in his bedroom, from whence they were afterwards stolen by the prisoner, who endeavoured to sell them for 2s 6d to Mrs Green, beerhouse keeper of Holt Fleet. Mrs Green having some suspicions refused to buy the articles, and communicated with Mrs

Packwood, the landlady of the Wharf Inn, and it was then discovered that the robbery had taken place. In the meantime the prisoner had bolted, and was afterwards found by a boatman named **Bond** lying in some long grass and feigning sleep. The waistcoat and tie were not found in his possession, but were lying hard by, where he had thrown them. He now pleaded guilty, and was sentenced to six weeks' imprisonment with hard labour.

36 July 4 1863

DROITWICH

ROBBERY FROM THE PERSON At the Borough Magistrates' Office on Monday, before J Blick (Mayor) and E Penrice Esqs, Jeremiah Leek of this borough, labourer, was charged by PS Harris with stealing from the person of **William Cull** of the same place, boatman, on the evening of Saturday last, the sum of 8s. Prisoner pleaded guilty, and was sentenced to one month's hard labour.

37 July 4 1863

WORCESTERSHIRE MIDSUMMER QUARTER SESSIONS

STEALING PLANKS AT NORTHFIELD **Edward Edmunds**, 35, labourer, was indicted for stealing eight planks of deal timber on the 22nd April, the property of Thomas Wilesmith. Mr Richards was for the prosecution. On the above day the prisoner, a boatman, was seen by a watchman named Allen to remove eight planks from his boat, when at Selly Oak, and put them into an old boat, in which a man named **Weston** and his wife were located. The next day, prisoner was apprehended, when he said that a man he saw near the Tardebigge tunnel offered him 3s to carry the planks to Selly Oak. The planks were produced and identified by the prosecutor, who lives at Worcester, and who said they were stolen from his wharf there. Prisoner, who had formerly been a soldier and borne a good character, was convicted, and sentenced to three months' imprisonment with hard labour.

38 July 18 1863

CITY POLICE

SURETIES OF THE POLICE **John Brace**, a boatman, was bound over in his own recognisances in the sum of £10 to keep the peace. In June last he was sent to prison for 14 days for a brutal assault on a woman named Emma Lemm, with whom he lived, and being a desperate character, he was now bound over and ordered to pay the costs, 8s.

39 August 1 1863

ACCIDENTS On Tuesday afternoon, as **George Percy**, a boatman on the Severn, was removing some timber into his boat at Diglis, a portion of it fell upon him, and it was a long time before he could be got from under. This was ultimately done, when it was found that his left leg was broken just above the ankle.

40 August 15 1863

SERIOUS ACCIDENTS On Saturday, as **George Mable**, a waterman, was working a crane on the Quay, the handle slipped from his grasp and struck him on the head, inflicting a wound several inches in length.

41 August 22 1863

STOURBRIDGE

FOUND DEAD On Saturday morning last about five o'clock, a boatman in the employ of Messrs Bradley and Co, named **James Hales**, aged 58, was found dead in the road near the White Lion Hotel in this town. It appeared deceased had been suffering from a rupture, and had been attended by Mr Lamb, surgeon, the previous evening, who ordered him not to go out ; he, however, did so, and death resulted from strangulated hernia.

42 September 5 1863

DROITWICH

BREACH OF THE PEACE At the Petty Sessions on Monday before J Blick (mayor) and T G Smith Esqs, **William Harris** and **Joseph Partridge**, boatmen, both of this borough, pleaded guilty to a charge of fighting in Hanbury Street at midnight on the 21st ultimo. The Mayor expressed the determination of the Bench to do all in their power to suppress such unseemly disturbances, and ordered defendants to find sureties of the peace for six calendar months, and to pay the costs.

43 September 19 1863

The Bishop of Worcester is to preach the annual sermon in aid of the funds for supporting the Watermen's Church on Wednesday next, the 23rd inst.

44 September 26 1863

THE BISHOP OF WORCESTER AND THE WATERMEN'S CHURCH The annual sermon in aid of the funds for supporting this church which, as its name implies, is intended for the watermen employed on the river Severn, was preached by the Bishop of the diocese on Wednesday afternoon. The congregation was a large one, including many of the parochial clergy, the sermon being the first his Lordship had preached in one of the city churches. Service was read by the Rev Charles Evans, rector of St Clement's, in whose parish the Watermen's Church is situated, and the sermon was founded on the 1st Epistle of John iii 8v :- "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil". It had been remarked, said his Lordship, that a tone of sadness was a characteristic of the life of man in general. The facts upon which this remark was founded were so common that, when attention was called to them, no one could refuse to acknowledge the truth. Man's condition is imperfect and unsatisfactory, and the pleasures of earth short lived and unprofitable. Inconsistencies of life and conduct are frequent, as are inexcusable departures from the way of goodness. A constant struggle is going on in life between good and evil, joy and sorrow, sin and righteousness. This was so with the great mass of mankind as far back as the records of history reached, down to the present generation. This struggle cannot be explained in any other way than by that indicated in the words of God, "God made man upright, but he has sought out many inventions". There was a time when there was no such struggle ; but the first state of man was destroyed, and confusion now reigns where all before was order. A wicked spirit is abroad tempting man to commit sin, and leading him on from one bad practice to another till at last he perishes by his own corruption. The gospel, however, teaches more than this. It bids us look beyond the present scene of human life and points to a brighter prospect in the future, where inconsistencies shall cease entirely and peace and happiness be restored to mankind for ever. "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested that He might destroy the works of the devil". There are chiefly two things in which our Lord gains the victory over the devil. The first by redeeming mankind from that state of hopelessness and danger into which they have been brought by sin, and the second in setting them free from their captivity to evil and giving them the means to resist the devil in after times. The prospect set before us in the gospel is full of joy. It contains the true solution of the difficulties of life, is the only sufficient refuge in trouble, our only source of comfort, the only safeguard from the dangers that beset us. The works of the devil are not so much destroyed that all our troubles cease ; but the foundation is laid of that peace and joy by which we can endure all suffering with patience, looking at it not only as a well deserved punishment, but as the loving chastisement of our Heavenly Father, who thus purifies his people. Neither are the works of the devil so much destroyed that all sin shall cease in man at once, but a way has been opened by which all men can escape from sin. If this were not true, the life of man would be a puzzle and a mystery, a scene of hopeless misery and despair. His Lordship then dwelt upon the necessity of a personal application of these truths, and said his brethren would not think he needed an excuse for taking the opportunity afforded by his first sermon in one of the city churches, to set forth an outline of the blessed gospel of which they were ministers. It was not only a good thing to hear as regarded themselves, but also with reference to other persons, for no one could be earnest in his own

salvation without feeling interested in the salvation of his fellow beings. Most of them need not be reminded that the church in which they were assembled was built for the use of watermen, who found occupation on the noble river Severn, and in memory of that faithful servant of God who first called attention to the spiritual destitution in which the watermen lived. Those who contributed to the building of the church desired to show their respect to the memory of that good man, and their gratitude to God, who put it into his heart to strive after the spiritual good of the watermen. They had determined that as far as in them lay, the work of that faithful servant of the Lord should not die away, and so they raised the building in the place of the decayed barge, which answered his purpose, and yet near the scene of the labours of the men whom he brought to join him in prayer and praise. The rector of the parish had considered it a high privilege, though it was one which entailed great labour, to carry on the work, and give two full services in the church every Sunday ; this great exertion demanded their thanks. Watermen led an unsettled life. They were brought up from childhood with bad examples before them ; the same examples were continued through life and, unless special provision were made for them, they had no opportunity of finding out the gospel way of ordering their lives. The blessing of spiritual comfort had been found by many who were induced to attend the church, and nothing more than this was required to lead his hearers to contribute towards the expenses of the church. The work of the ministry was here done free of charge, and all that was asked for was the means of meeting what were called "the church expenses". At the close of the service, a collection was made which amounted to £29 2s 7 1/2d.

45 October 3 1863

BIDFORD

A BOATMAN DROWNED On Friday evening as the men in the employ of Mr George Hendly were towing a boat up the Avon, the steersman, named **William Edginton**, fell into the water and was drowned. It would appear from circumstances connected with the event that he was using a shaft to heave the boat from the bank when, by some means, he fell overboard. His companions, who heard a noise, looked back and called out, but received no answer. They then returned to the boat and, not finding the man, suspected what had happened, but could discover no trace of him, and of course could render no assistance. The body was found in about an hour afterwards, and Mr G H Fosbroke, surgeon, was on the spot, but all means of resuscitation were powerless. An inquest was held upon the body on Monday, and a verdict of "Accidental death" returned.

46 October 31 1863

CITY POLICE

RIOTOUS **Jas Nicholl**, a boatman, charged with using abusive language, kicking PC Arkell and tearing a piece out of PC Gibbons's coat, was fined 5s with 3s 6d costs, or seven days' imprisonment.

47 October 31 1863

FAREWELL MEETING The Rev C H Dimont, who has administered the Word of Truth so acceptably at the Watermen's Church as curate of St Clements for the last two years, being about to leave this city, his friends, to the number of about one hundred, met this (Friday) evening in the Watermen's Church, and after partaking of tea, presented the Rev gentleman with a handsome timepiece and a well lined purse. The timepiece was supplied by Messrs Sharratt and Co of this city.

48 November 7 1863

CITY POLICE **Richard Dayus**, boatman, was fined £1 including costs for an offence against the Canal Company's Act.

49 November 21 1863

CITY POLICE

ASSAULTING A BOATMAN **Thomas Holloway** was charged with assaulting **Henry Philpott**, another boatman. The complainant said the defendant had “paid him some money”, and he did not wish to press the charge. On defendant's paying the costs, the case was dismissed.

50 December 5 1863

CITY POLICE

THREATENING A WIFE AND SON **Charles Williams**, a boatman, was charged with using threatening language towards his wife, **Hannah Williams**, and his son. The wife gave defendant a very decent character, but said that on Saturday night he got drunk – so drunk that he took a fowl, which he had won in a raffle, and threw it on the fire, afterwards threatening to ill use her. The case was not pressed, and defendant was discharged with an admonition.

51 December 19 1863

DROITWICH BOROUGH POLICE, MONDAY DECEMBER 14

DRUNK **John Pittaway** of this place, boatman, was brought up in custody of PS Harris, charged with being drunk and disorderly on Saturday night, the 12th instant, in the parish of St Andrew. The officer stated that about half past eleven o'clock on Saturday night, he heard a noise in Rickett's Lane, and on going there saw defendant and his wife, both of whom were drunk and creating a great disturbance. Fined 5s and 6s 6d costs. The money was paid.

>>>***<<<

52 February 4 1865

BROMSGROVE At the Magistrates' Office on Tuesday before F Watt Esq (Chairman), the Rev G H Biggs and R Smallwood Esq, **Edward Hewett**, boatman, was charged with stealing 1 cwt of coal, value 1s, the property of Henry Thompson, coal dealer and publican of Stoke Pond. Committed for 21 days' hard labour.

53 February 4 1865

POLICE INTELLIGENCE

ROBBING AN EMPLOYER **Thomas Cottrill**, a waggoner in the employ of Mr Price, coal and hay dealer of St John's, was charged with stealing hay to the value of 3s 3d, the property of his master, and **Samuel Jones**, a boatman in the same employ, was charged with receiving the hay. Mr Tree was for the defence of Jones. About eight o'clock on Saturday evening, a workman named Charles Hyde saw Cottrill take the hay from Mr Price's stable and put it on board a barge lying alongside the wharf, where it was covered over with a boat cloth by Jones. When apprehended by PC Williams, Cottrill said the hay was taken to feed one of Mr Price's horses with. For the defence of Jones, a witness named Samuel Meredith was called. His testimony went to prove an alibi. Prisoners were committed for trial at the assizes, bail being accepted. In reply to the Mayor, Mr Price said he was willing to employ Cottrill again.

54 February 11 1865

COUNTY PETTY SESSIONS

ANOTHER ILLEGAL POSSESSION CASE **Herbert Webb**, boatman, was charged with having, on the 9th December 1861, had in his possession a certain instrument called a “griff” for the purpose of taking salmon. Mr George said that the summons was issued under the 11th section of the Salmon Fishery Act. John Griffiths, conservator, stated that the fish were in the habit of ascending the Diglis water at the north west angle ; and on the day in question, he saw the defendant with several other men near the weir. The defendant had a stick something like a broomstick, which he laid on the putcher. Witness saw a fish coming up the river, and the men were waiting for it. The

fish, however, drew back, and the men appeared to be disappointed. Defendant refused to give his name, and hid himself in the cabin of one of Mr Danks's boats. He afterwards ran away and, though he was followed for some distance, he finally eluded the conservator. Prisoner stated that he should have given his name to the conservator had he been told him the purpose for which he wanted it. He also said that the conservator went into the office of his master (Mr Danks) and told the agent that he could swear that it was the waggoner by his black whiskers. John Jenkins stated that he was in company with the defendant on the day in question. He did not see any salmon caught, but they were trying to catch a few lamperns. There were ten or a dozen in company. The defendant had a stick, but it was only one out of the hedge, which he used to walk with. The Bench said that, though they were disposed to give every credence to the statement of the conservator, yet they would give the defendant the benefit of the doubt and dismiss the case. The last witness, Jenkins, was then cautioned by the Bench, he having on several occasions used abusive language towards the conservator.

55 February 11 1865

THE OBSERVANCE OF THE SABBATH On Friday evening last, a meeting was held at the Natural History Room, at which was discussed "The Claims of the Christian Sabbath, and its connection with National and Individual Prosperity". There was a good attendance, and amongst those present on the platform were :- Revds W Allan MA (Deputation), Charles Bullock (in the chair), Charles Evans, W Wright, E Wynne, F G Lagard, B Smart, E Robinson, T Dodd, H E Von Sturmer &c. The meeting having been opened with prayer, the various speakers dwelt upon the Jewish and Christian Sabbaths, remarking upon the manner in which that day should be spent. Rev W Allan, in the course of his remarks, stated that the Lord's Day Observance Society had been established about 35 years ago, and that he hoped the time would come ere long when a branch society would be formed in Worcester. He then spoke of the large number who were prevented from looking upon Sunday as a day of rest – instancing barmaids, postmen, railway servants, bargemen, cabmen, omnibus drivers &c, to whom he was sure the efforts of the society would be of great advantage. After hearing a few other remarks on the same subject, the meeting separated.

56 February 18 1865

BROMSGROVE At the Petty Sessions on Tuesday, before the Rev G H Biggs, Capt Bourne, the Rev Dr Collis and John Corbett Esq, John Ashton was charged by **Henry Thompson**, boatman and publican, with stealing 4s 11d in coppers from a boat cabin on the Worcester and Birmingham Canal on the 22nd ultimo. Thompson stated that on the 21st January last he tied up his boat on the canal near his house. He had on the previous day placed a packet containing 4s 11d in coppers on the shelf in the cabin of the boat, and he saw the packet there safe about two o'clock in the afternoon of the 21st January. About six o'clock the same afternoon, the prisoner and a man named Tolley (who has not been yet apprehended) were at his house and asked permission to stop in the boat all night, and he gave them leave. They left about seven o'clock, and about an hour afterwards he went to the boat, but neither of them was there. On Thompson going to the boat again the following morning, he missed the packet of coppers, and afterwards accused the prisoner and the other of stealing it. The prisoner twice said, "I did not do it", but afterwards admitted it. The prisoner and the other man appear to have been at Thompson's house on the morning of the 21st January, and had a pint of cider, which came to 1 1/2d, but the prisoner said he only had a penny, which he gave Mrs Thompson, and she trusted him for the other halfpenny ; and they did no work that day. In the evening, the prisoner and Tolley went to the inn kept by William Yeates at Stoke Prior, and stayed there about four hours, spending between three and four shillings, which was all paid in coppers. On being apprehended by PC Beach, prisoner said, "I shan't deny it ; we did take it, and went up to Yeates's and spent it all but 5d. I hope I shan't have to suffer for all, as Tolley had a share of it". Committed for trial at the sessions.

57 March 4 1865

POLICE INTELLIGENCE **William Brace**, boatman, charged with stealing 4 cwt of coal, the property of the Royal Porcelain Works, was committed for trial at the Assizes.

58 March 4 1865

WORCESTERSHIRE ADJOURNED SESSIONS

PLEADED GUILTY **John Ashton**, 23, boatman, charged with stealing 4s 11d, the property of Mr Thompson of Stoke Prior, from a boat on the Worcester and Birmingham Canal. One month's hard labour.

59 March 4 1865

POLICE INTELLIGENCE

DISORDERLY **James Bennett**, boatman, was charged by PC Morgan with being drunk and disorderly in Hylton Street at 12.45 on the morning of the 26th. Defendant and two other young men were making a great noise, and on being ordered away, were abusive to the police. Defendant's companions were the worst behaved, upsetting a wheelbarrow on the roadway and thereby endangering the traffic. Remanded.

60 March 11 1865

CITY PRISONERS

STEALING HAY Thomas Cottrill, labourer, was indicted for stealing a truss of hay on the 28th of January last, the property of his master, Mr William Price, hay and coal dealer of this city. The jury found the prisoner guilty, and he was sentenced to three months' hard labour. **Samuel Jones**, boatman, was sentenced to three months' hard labour for receiving the same, knowing it to have been stolen.

THE ALLEGED COAL STEALING AT DIGLIS **William Brace**, a boatman, was indicted for stealing four cwt of coal, the property of the Worcester Porcelain Company, on the 27th February. Mr Best prosecuted and Mr Motteram defended. The first witness called was PC Williams of the city force, who stated that he watched prisoner take a boat, which had been unloaded at the china manufactory, up to the wharf at Lowesmoor. He there saw him put a quantity of coal out of the fore cabin on the ground, and charged him with stealing it. Prisoner begged that he would say nothing about it. Other evidence was given, but it appeared that the prisoner was employed by the company to convey coal to their works, and after every voyage a draft of coal was allowed him, but on this particular occasion prisoner took more than was due to him. Mr F H Needham and Mr Beesley, coal dealers of this city, gave prisoner an excellent character, and the jury found him not guilty. The learned gentleman reminded him of the narrow escape he had had, and hoped it would be a warning to him.

61 March 18 1865

STOURPORT At the Magistrates' Office on Wednesday, before the Rev C T Farley and S Baker Esq, **William Barnett**, surveyor of the River Severn Horse Towing-path Company, summoned **William Pennell**, boatman, for defrauding the company of the sum of 2s by taking out a ticket at the Mitton Hall Station for a less distance than he travelled along. Fined £1 and costs.

62 May 20 1865

BEWDLEY On Saturday, a boy named William Dalloway, about five years of age, fell into the river Severn. The current carried the little fellow a considerable distance, but he was rescued from a watery grave by **Mr W Phillips**, boatman of this town.

63 May 27 1865

DROITWICH At the Borough Magistrates' Office on Thursday, **Richard Harris alias Dicky**

Duke of this borough, bargeman, was summoned for being drunk and riotous in Friar Street on Saturday the 13th inst. The offence was proved by Mary Ann Bourne, who resides in the same neighbourhood. Fined 10s and 9s 6d costs, or twenty one days' hard labour ; allowed until Saturday to pay.

64 June 3 1865

STOURBRIDGE

SUSPECTED MURDER On Tuesday evening, the body of a servant girl was found in the canal at Wollaston Bridge, under circumstances which suggest that she fell the victim of a murderer. The deceased's name was Mary Dorrell, 22 years of age, and in service at Mr Henry Hicklin's at Wollaston. On Saturday night, she asked permission to go into Stourbridge for an hour, and started off at about eight o'clock. She never returned. Her absence on the Saturday night had subsequently led to Mr Hicklin's writing to her parents on Monday last, to ask if she had returned home. The girl's friends live at the Wren's Nest near Dudley, but they returned no answer to the inquiry contained in this letter. About six o'clock on Tuesday evening, a boat belonging to the Stourbridge Ironworks was passing the Wollaston Bridge, in charge of two men named **Meeze** and **Smith**, when the motion of the water caused a dead body to rise to the surface. The boatmen saw the clothes in the water, and got the body out on to the towing path. It was that of the girl Dorrell. In the pocket of her dress was a pair of silk gloves, which she had purchased on Saturday night in Stourbridge, and doubtless intended to wear on the Sunday. This alone disposed of the intention to commit suicide ; but, in addition, a severe bruise on the right eye suggested that she had been wilfully pushed into the canal. On the removal of her clothing, another bruise, apparently from a kick, was found on her hip, and her arms were scarred, though the latter marks might, and probably were, caused by the passing of a boat. It appears to be the general opinion that the girl has been murdered.

65 June 10 1865

CHILD DROWNED To be added to the numerous list of persons drowned lately is a little boy named John Bell, who fell into the river at the top of Hylton Street on Tuesday evening. He was last seen alive by his grandfather, John Richardson, at about six o'clock, and at about half past seven a waterman named **Charles Webb** dragged the river opposite Mr Rowlands's, and picked up the body of the child. At the inquest held on Wednesday at the Royal George Inn, St Clement's Street, before the city coroner R T Rea Esq, the jury returned a verdict "that deceased was found in the Severn, but there was no evidence to show how he came there".

66 June 17 1865

BROMSGROVE At the Petty Sessions on Tuesday, **Thomas Tolley**, a boatman, was charged with stealing 4s 11d in coppers, in company with John Ashton (who had before been convicted) on the 21st of January last, the property of **Henry Thompson**. PC Beech apprehended prisoner on the 8th inst at Kingsnorton, and charged him with stealing 4s 11d, in company with John Ashton, from a boat, the property of Henry Thompson, on the 21st of January, when he said, "It's no use denying it ; the money was spent, and I had share of it". Committed for one month's hard labour.

67 July 8 1865

A BOY DROWNED IN THE SEVERN An inquest was held at ten o'clock on Saturday evening last at the Grand Stand Inn before the City Coroner, Mr R T Rea Esq, on the body of a youth named William Darke, aged 15, who was accidentally drowned when taking the ferry boat across the Severn on the same afternoon. From the evidence it appeared that Eliza Pullen, the servant at the Stand, saw the deceased, (who was also employed there, and regularly attended the ferry boat) go towards the ferry boat between three and four o'clock. She went upstairs, and hearing the cry of "Boat" shortly afterwards, went down to the Ferry to see where Darke was. She saw the boat about half way across the river, and deceased struggling in the water. He didn't cry out, and sank in her

sight. She raised an alarm, when **John Overton**, a boatman, took one of Maynard's boats to the place where witness saw deceased sink, and commenced searching for his body. There was a little boy in the boat, whom deceased was taking over the river. George Bailey of Henwick, having heard the alarm, stated that he fetched a large pole, which he used for "knocking apples off the trees", and commenced to search for the body. In about half an hour from when deceased sank in the water, witness recovered the body and brought it to shore. There was no evidence to show how he came into the water ; but it is supposed that deceased's paddle or oar became unshipped, and that he lost his balance and so fell in. The jury returned a verdict that deceased was accidentally drowned.

68 August 5 1865

POLICE INTELLIGENCE

ASSAULT ON A WIFE **William Farr**, a boatman living in Dolday, was brought up under a warrant, charged with assaulting his wife. The wife did not press the charge, and the prisoner was discharged on entering into his own recognisances to keep the peace in the sum of £10, and paying the costs, 8s.

69 August 26 1865

KIDDERMINSTER At the Guildhall on Saturday, before H Talbot Esq, **Joseph Malland** and **George Millward**, boatmen, were charged with stealing 14 cwt of coal belonging to Messrs Jeffrys of Clensmore Lane. They were remanded to the County Petty Sessions.

70 September 2 1865

POLICE INTELLIGENCE

STEALING A WATCH **Charles Bevan**, on remand, charged with stealing a watch on Monday evening from the person of **Henry Hooper**, a boatman, while asleep in the Hole In The Wall public house, was committed to the Sessions.

ASSAULT **William Bishop**, a boatman, was charged with assaulting Elizabeth Brace on 26th August. Ordered to pay the costs, 7s 6d.

71 September 9 1865

DEATH BY DROWNING An inquest was held on Saturday at the Navigation Inn, Lowesmoor, before R T Rea Esq, city coroner, on the body of a boy named Thomas Gough, aged three years, who resided with his parents in Merrivale. He wandered from his home on Monday week, and his body was found in the canal on the following Thursday by two men engaged at work on the Lowesmoor Wharf. The following evidence was adduced :- Mary Gough of Merrivale, mother of the deceased, stated that he was about 3 years and 5 months old. Last Monday, he returned from All Saints' Infant School at about twelve o'clock. Witness took him upstairs and gave him a whip to play with, and he asked her to let him go and play with some other children. She consented and he went, but did not come back at dinner time. Shortly after one o'clock she began to search for the child, as he was in the habit of wandering about. She went into Lowesmoor in consequence of what a little boy told her, that he had seen deceased on Lowesmoor Bridge. She made enquiries in the neighbourhood, but could hear nothing of him, and she had him cried the same night. Thomas Hinett of Lowesmoor, coal heaver, stated that he worked at Lowesmoor Wharf, and on Thursday afternoon some persons gave an alarm that there was something in the water. Witness stood on a stack of coal, and saw that a "human being" was in the water. He fetched his rake, got into a boat, and brought the body of deceased ashore. **Thomas Kinsey** of Copenhagen Street, boatman, gave corroborative evidence ; he saw the last witness get the child out of the water. The coroner remarked that no suspicion attached itself to any person, and the jury returned a verdict that deceased was found drowned in the canal on Thursday last, but there was no evidence to show how he came there.

72 September 16 1865

STOURBRIDGE At the Magistrates' Office on Wednesday, before the Revds C T Farley and Thomas Baker, and John Watson Esq, William Hill, Charles Hill and Edward Cox, boat builders of this town, were charged by **Samuel Weaver**, lock-keeper in the employ of the Canal Company, with assaulting him on the 30th ult. On that day, **Mr John Beach**, the agent to the Canal Company, and Weaver went to the dock where defendants were working. Mr Beach made some complaint as to the loss of water, and asked where the trap for fishing was, and Hill then abused him. Mr Beach directed Weaver to go again the same day to the dock to examine the valves. He did so, and William Hill went to him and told him to go away. Weaver went away, but returned shortly afterwards, and defendants C Hill and E Cox cried out to stop the ----. William Hill said complainant should not go through that road. Charles Hill then struck complainant with a piece of wood he had in his hand on the head. The blow was a severe one, and rendered complainant senseless and cut his tongue. The three defendants then dragged Weaver into the middle of the dock yard and left him. Mr Watson appeared for complainant. Defendants were fined 15s each and expenses.

73 September 30 1865

COUNTY PETTY SESSIONS

DRUNK AND DISORDERLY **Benjamin Cox**, waterman, was charged by Sergeant Pardoe with being drunk and disorderly at Ombersley. Fined 13s 2d, or in default seven days' imprisonment.

74 October 14 1865

WATERMEN'S CHURCH The annual sermon in aid of this church was preached this (Friday) afternoon by the Rev C Evans, Rector of St Clement's.

75 October 21 1865

WORCESTER CITY SESSIONS

ROBBERY FROM THE PERSON **Charles Bevan**, 27, boatman, was indicted for stealing a silver watch and gold chain from the person of John Brown, at the Hole In The Wall public house on the 23rd August. Mr Godson prosecuted. Prisoner was found guilty, and previous convictions having been proved by PC Williams, he was sentenced to 12 months' hard labour.

76 November 25 1865

TEWKESBURY At the Borough Sessions at the Town Hall on Friday, before G Blizard Esq (Mayor), R Balding, W Allard, J F Prosser and P Thomas Esqs, **William Broadwell**, boatman of Tewkesbury, was charged with assaulting PC Hadley on the 1st November, whilst in the execution of his duty. Superintendent Day did not wish to press for a heavy fine, as if Broadwell had not been drunk, the assault would not have taken place. Fined 5s and 11s costs, or in default committed to prison for fourteen days. The money was paid.

77 December 2 1865

DEATH BY DROWNING On Monday last, **Henry Wyre**, a boatman, was found drowned in the Severn near Hartlebury. It appears that on the 31st of October, the barge in which deceased was came into collision with a boat, and he fell overboard. His body was only recovered last Monday, and was in such a state of decomposition that it could only be identified by the clothes. An inquest was held by W P Hughes Esq, deputy coroner, when a verdict of "Accidentally drowned" was returned.

78 December 9 1865

A NARROW ESCAPE One morning last week, as PC Barker was going his rounds, he heard a splash in the river ; hastening to the spot he found a man struggling in the water, and fortunately succeeded in getting him out. It appeared that the man was a boatman named **Harris** from

Droitwich. He was in his barge, and thinking he was close to the Quay, stepped out and fell into the water, it being too dark to see.

79 December 30 1865

POLICE INTELLIGENCE

STEALING WEARING APPAREL Sarah Cotterill, a wretched looking woman, was charged on remand with stealing a quantity of wearing apparel. PC Osborne found her asleep in an entry with a number of articles of clothing in her possession. **John Taylor**, boatman, identified the clothes, which he said he lost at the Cross about half past eleven on the night of the 19th. He was not drunk, but felt someone take the bundle from him. He did not know who it was, and went on to his boat. Prisoner said that Taylor gave her the bundle to carry home for him. Discharged.

80 January 6 1866

THE LATE MR WELLS An inquest on the body of the late Mr Wells, which was found in the Severn on Friday, was held on that evening before the city coroner, R T Rea Esq, when the following evidence was given :-

Joseph Burch of Henwick Gate said that on Saturday morning last, he saw the deceased at his gate on a grey pony ; he paid the toll and passed through. Witness asked him how he and the family were, and he said he was middling. About half past eight o'clock in the evening, he saw someone leaning against the post on the Hallow side ; and his grandson, at his request, brought a candle to him. He found it was the deceased ; he was very tipsy. He spoke to him two or three times, but all he could make out of it was, "Bring my horse, bring my horse". He wished him to come into his house, but he could not get him to move or answer. There were several persons passing and repassing the gate, and when he looked for him again, he found he was gone.

John Fortey of the Bear Inn said deceased was a customer of his. He brought his horse to his house on Saturday morning last, about ten o'clock. He told him that his brother was going to ride his horse back, and he was going to walk. He returned to the Bear about seven o'clock. He did not see him, but he heard him. He should say he was fresh when he left his house. He was brought there about half past seven o'clock that day. He was searched in his presence by a constable ; there was a bottle of medicine and a box of pills, which were dissolved, a piece of cigar, a shilling and some other things in his pocket. There did not appear to be any marks of violence on his body. The deceased had only one glass of ale at his house, and that was in the morning.

John Wells of Woodhall Farm, Hallow, said the deceased was his brother. He was joint occupier of Woodhall Farm with him. He was twenty nine years of age. He started from home to Worcester last Saturday about nine o'clock. He stated that he wanted to see a doctor, as he had not been very well for some time past. He afterwards went to Worcester himself, and they were together at the Bear Inn about eight o'clock in the evening. The deceased started home leaving him behind, and left the pony upon which he had ridden into Worcester for him to ride home. He appeared to be in his usual spirits up to the time he left. His brother was fresh when he parted from him at the Bear Inn.

Charles Tringham of Bridge Place, shoemaker, said that on Saturday evening last, he started to market from his house, and went along the side of the Severn by the chains on the Quay or landing place. When he was opposite the back of the Royal George, he heard a groan. He turned back and found a man lying partly under the chains, with his head towards the water. He picked him up, and got him against the chain near the Royal George. He appeared to be very much intoxicated. He spoke to him, and asked him if he knew the danger he was in. He made no answer. He cautioned him of his danger three or four times. He answered him with abuse. He left him holding by the chain, and he was apprehensive that he might be abused. This was about half past eight.

John Reynolds, boatman of Doldy, said he lived at the back of the Ewe and Lamb. That morning, about eleven o'clock, he was in a boat with his two sons, on the Severn. The boat was aground. On lifting a line that was attached to the boat that was in the water, the body of a man was pulled to the top of the water. He brought him to the shore, and sent for a constable. Afterwards he and George

Small carried him into the stable.

This being the whole of the evidence, the jury found a verdict that the deceased was found in the Severn, but there was no evidence to show how he got there.

81 January 6 1866

WORCESTERSHIRE EPIPHANY SESSIONS

ASSAULT AT OMBERSLEY **Henry Bond**, 40, boatman, for assaulting Mary Bond at Ombersley on the 29th October, was fined 40s and bound over in his own recognisances to keep the peace for 12 months.

STEALING A HORSE AT OLDBURY **Edward Holden**, 25, boatman, was indicted for having, at the parish of Oldbury, feloniously stolen a gelding, the property of Thomas Peasland. Mr Watkins prosecuted. Prisoner was found guilty, and pleading guilty to a former conviction, he was sentenced to seven years' penal servitude.

82 January 20 1866

BEWDLEY On Thursday afternoon last, two boatmen named **William Noakes** of Bewdley and **James Aston** of Wribbenhall, both in the employ of Mr Samuel Jeffries, timber merchant of this town, met with a watery grave whilst drifting a long boat laden with timber down the Severn. The water was very high and the current extremely rapid at the time. Everything went on smoothly till they reached the Railway Bridge about half a mile above Bewdley, when a sudden gust of wind drove the boat with great violence against the middle arch, which immediately capsized her and threw the two men in charge into the stream, the timber very probably falling on them, as they were not seen afterwards. Both were considered expert hands, and Noakes was quite a model boatman. He would never work on the Sabbath day, daily perused his Bible, which was his cabin companion, and not only perused but endeavoured to act up to its teachings. Each leaves a wife and child to mourn their untimely end.

83 February 10 1866

POLICE INTELLIGENCE

VAGRANCY **James Knight**, boatman, was charged with sleeping in a stable belonging to Mr Williams. PC Brown stated that on Sunday night he met Alfred Brown, who stated that he had been looking for a policeman to turn a man out of Mr Williams's stable. Witness went and took prisoner into custody. Prisoner stated that he had leave to sleep in the stable ; he thought it belonged to Mr Brayley. Discharged.

84 February 10 1866

ALLEGED MURDER OF A WIFE AT BRENTFORD On Saturday, **George Pepper**, a bargeman 55 years of age, was brought before the Brentford Magistrates charged with the wilful murder of his wife, Harriet, aged 57 years. On the 12th ult, the prisoner, who was drunk, attempted to murder his wife, an invalid, and threw her from the chair to the floor. She said to a person who assisted her up, "I know I shall die ; that old brute knocked me off the chair". The prisoner said, "Die if you want to die ; nobody will be sorry for you", and then threatened to break her neck. A surgical examination having been made, both the thighs of the deceased were found broken. She died on the 19th of January from these injuries. She suffered from disease of the heart, was deformed, and could not move without the aid of a stick or crutch. The prisoner, in his defence, denied having touched the deceased. He was committed for trial for the wilful murder of his wife.

85 February 10 1866

DROITWICH The usual monthly court was held on Monday at the Court Chamber. John Harris of the Vines, saltmaker, and **James Price**, bargeman, were respectively committed for 7 days at the suit of John Rowlands.

86 March 3 1866

CITY GENERAL SESSIONS

STEALING LEAD Frederick Lees, butcher, and **George Harris**, boatman, were charged with stealing 40 lbs of lead from a house belonging to Mr E Wheeler of this city on the 30th January last. Prisoners, who pleaded not guilty, were undefended. Mr Ainsley prosecuted. On the date named, the prisoners were seen by Mrs Prosser, a tenant of Mr Wheeler's residing in the Shambles, in an entry leading to her house, and some lead being missed, suspicion fell upon the prisoners, who were charged with stealing the lead, and who virtually confessed their guilt, each charging the other with having incited him to commit the robbery. PC Williams deposed to having examined the house, and found some of the lead had been removed. He told Harris he was charged with stealing the lead, and he replied, "I was at Foss's last night at ten o'clock". He apprehended him, and subsequently, on taking the other prisoner into custody, he said, "I will tell the truth, it was Harris told me to do it ; this is all through getting into bad company". The jury found both prisoners guilty, and Lees was sentenced to three months' hard labour and Harris to six months' hard labour.

STEALING A BOAT LINE **Joseph Wilks** and **Charles Hawker**, boatmen, failed to answer to their bail on the charge of stealing a boat line belonging to John Edmunds on the 19th January last. The recognisances were therefore enlarged until the next sessions.

87 March 24 1866

UPTON-ON-SEVERN **John Drinkwater**, waterman of this town, has, with two Gloucester men, been committed for trial at Gloucester on a charge of being concerned in the theft of some Indian corn, the property of Messrs Sturge and Co, corn merchants.

88 April 7 1866

A BOATMAN DROWNED AT DIGLIS **William Holtham**, a boatman in the employ of Mr Pitt of the Brick Yard near the Rhydd, was drowned on Thursday night, having fallen out of his boat when near the canal lock at Diglis. An inquest will be held today at the Anchor Inn, Diglis.

89 April 14 1866

HANLEY CASTLE An inquest was held on Monday at the Anchor Inn, Diglis, Worcester, before Mr W S P Hughes, coroner, on the body of a boatman named **Holtham**, who was drowned in the canal near to the Diglis lock on Thursday night. The deceased was in the employ of Mr Pitt of the brickyards near the Rhydd, and about nine o'clock at night was going to his boat when, it is supposed, he slipped from the towing-path and fell in. An alarm was at once given by a boy who was with him, and some other boatmen who were nearby threw in a rope, but the deceased failed to catch hold of it, and sunk under the water and was drowned. His body was not recovered until some time afterwards. The jury returned a verdict of "Accidental death".

90 May 12 1866

POLICE INTELLIGENCE

CASE OF PERJURY Adelaide Wainwright was charged with committing perjury at the Guildhall on the 12th ult. The circumstances were these :- A man named Elt was charged with stealing some fowls, and prisoner being called upon to give evidence at the hearing of the case, said that Elt went to her house on the night when the fowls were stolen, and asked her to cook the fowls which he had brought with him ; and subsequently hearing of the fowls being stolen, gave information which led to Elt's apprehension. Committed for trial at the next Assizes.

William Wood, boatman, was then charged on his own admission with stealing the two fowls alleged to have been taken by Elt, on the 3rd of April. The prosecutor having deposed to the loss of the fowls from his residence, the Moore, the prisoner was committed for trial.

91 May 26 1866

BANKRUPTS John Withy, Hopwood, Worcestershire, boatman.

92 May 26 1866

BEWDLEY On Tuesday, Jane Holder, aged eleven years, was drowned in the Severn, a short distance below Bewdley. The body was recovered the following morning, and the same day an inquest was held at the Black Boy Inn, Wribbenhall, by H Saunders Esq, coroner. **Benjamin Darkes**, waterman, searched for deceased, and found the body in 15 feet of water. He was led to search there from seeing the footmarks of a child, and finding a piece of carpeting, which was identified as that in which she was sent to carry sticks for which she had been sent from home. Catherine Holder, the deceased's mother, stated that she had no quarrel whatever with the child. This evidence was contradicted by Ann Fitkin, a neighbour, who had been told by Mrs Holder that she had had words with her daughter. The father said he knew of no quarrel, and the jury returned a verdict of "Found drowned". The Coroner cautioned the mother against harsh treatment of children, and expressed himself very dissatisfied with the way in which she had given her evidence. This was concurred in by the jury.

93 June 16 1866

BEWDLEY At the Borough Petty Sessions on Saturday, before A M Clinch Esq, Mayor, and J Nicholls Esq, **John Smith**, boatman residing in Lax Lane, was charged with trespassing on the lands of T Summers Esq in pursuit of game. The defendant had placed several gins with the intention of catching rabbits. These were discovered and watched till about eleven o'clock on the night of the 7th inst, when Smith made his appearance at the snares, and was immediately captured. Information was laid by Mr Rickaby, trainer to Mr Summers. Defendant pleaded guilty, and was fined £1 and 10s costs, in default one month's imprisonment with hard labour ; money paid.

94 July 28 1866

"ONE MORE UNFORTUNATE" Last night the Severn received another victim. At midnight, a woman saw a man hasten on to the bridge, and after a hurried and of course ineffectual attempt to force himself through the railings, place a foot on the top bar and leap into the middle of the stream. The woman screamed, "Murder", men hurried up, and in a few minutes, as is always the case on such occasions – much to the credit of those who do it – two or three boats were upon the river and, directed by the woman who gave the alarm, a prompt search was made for the drowning man. Some minutes elapsed – minutes that were ages to the bystanders, who could do nothing to save the endangered life, and then a cry comes from one of the boats, the others close round it, and with the recovered body between them make for the quay steps. Then comes the usual scene – a tender hearted, sympathising but ignorant crowd of spectators surround the body. Everybody is directing everybody else, and the directions are wholly such as ought not to be followed ; the prevailing notion still being, in spite of all the press has published to the contrary, that the most effectual mode of restoring animation is to "hold the body up by the heels". Expostulation is useless, and a policeman is not at hand. One is found, however, who is as much at a loss to proceed as the crowd, but one thing he insists upon, and that is the removal of the body to the nearest public house. This is done. Is it strange to hear that the man does not recover, or can it be expected that so long as the river is left unwatched by someone who knows what should be done to help drowned persons and has authority to do it, any such persons will be recovered? If the citizens of Worcester could but once witness a scene like that of last night, they would, we are convinced, insist that a policeman should be regularly set to river duty, or better that the Humane Society should be induced to appoint an officer for the duty. Last night's victim was a poor crack brained fellow named Stephen Hewitt. He has for some weeks past been rambling about the city playing a violin, and it will be remembered was recently stopped at the Cathedral from playing his violin during service. He was, we believe, formerly a member of a military band, afterwards bandmaster to H M S *Dragon*, and subsequently leader of a band of travelling minstrels. His career appears to have been of a most

chequered character. This afternoon, Mr Rea, the city coroner, held an inquest at the Wherry Inn upon the body, when the facts as stated above were deposed to by George Packwood, who saw the deceased jump into the river and swim for 50 yards. **Joseph Slater**, a waterman of Upton-on-Severn, took the body from the water and helped to carry it to the Wherry Inn. Mr H Hill, surgeon, was sent for, but life was extinct. Several articles were found upon the deceased, including two discharges from the Navy and a life assurance book of the Victoria Legal Provident Assurance Society. PC Stringer said he had known the deceased about two months. He played the violin, and was an eccentric character. The widow of the deceased, who was a very young woman, said she and her husband had been in Worcester for 12 weeks. He was both a painter and musician. For the last six weeks he had been drinking, getting his money by playing the violin. He had tea with her at six o'clock last night, and she again saw him playing the violin behind the Artillery Band. She said he had several times threatened to drown himself, and had run towards the water to frighten her. He threatened to drown himself on Wednesday night. He had told her that fifteen years ago he had been stabbed in the head, and ever after in the summer he had been very excited. The Coroner, in summing up, said there did not appear to be sufficient evidence to show that deceased intended to drown himself, and the jury returned a verdict that the deceased was drowned.

95 August 18 1866

DROITWICH At the Borough Magistrates' Office on Saturday, before the Mayor and S S Roden Esq, **George Prosser**, labourer, charged with neglecting the service of his master, **James Ewers**, boatman on Thursday the 8th inst, was committed for seven days.

96 September 22 1866

DROITWICH At the County Petty Sessions on Friday, before E Bearcroft Esq (in the chair) and the Rev W W Douglas, John Hill, labourer, and **John Wright**, boatman, were charged with being drunk and creating a disturbance. They were committed to the house of correction for one month with hard labour, and at the end of such period to find sureties for their future good behaviour for twelve calendar months.

97 September 22 1866

STOURPORT On Friday night, a boatman named **William Cox** from Turley, Gloucestershire, was drowned in the Severn. Deceased was seen safe in his boat by his employer, who left him there, and it appears that he got up after sleeping some time and attempted to come out of the boat, and being drunk, fell into the water. An inquest was deemed unnecessary.

98 October 6 1866

ACCIDENTS **John Pimble**, 56, a boatman, fell from a canal bridge at Stourport on Monday and fractured his collar bone. He is receiving attention at the Infirmary.

99 October 20 1866

CITY SESSIONS

CHARGE OF EMBEZZLEMENT **Samuel Brooks**, 51, boatman (on bail) was indicted for receiving £15 for, and on account of, Mr Charles Beesley, his employer, and with embezzling the same. Mr Godson prosecuted, and Mr Griffiths defended. The prisoner was sent from Worcester with 13 1/2 cwt of hay to sell for the prosecutor at Birmingham. It was his duty to return all the money he received for the hay to his employer. He received £2 5s from Mr W E Weal, £9 16s 6d from Mr Brierly and £2 19s 6d from Mr White for the hay, neither of which sums he had repaid his employer. As the prisoner did not return, the prosecutor went to Birmingham and found the empty boat, and learned that the prisoner had gone. Four months' hard labour.

100 October 27 1866

WATERMEN'S CHURCH A sermon in aid of the funds of this church will be preached in the

building on Friday next by the Rev Canon Wood.

101 November 10 1866

BROMSGROVE

PETTY SESSIONS **Charles Dunn**, boatman, was charged on the information of Mr John Jones, Stoke Court, with killing game without a licence at Stoke Prior on the 11th of October. George Wilmore saw the defendant shoot at a hare in a field of Mr Jones's, and he afterwards saw him come across the hedge with the hare in his hand. Mr Hadley pleaded good character in extenuation, and stated that the man had been brought all the way from Gloucester. The magistrates taking these facts into consideration, inflicted a penalty of £2, including costs, or twenty one days' hard labour.

102 November 10 1866

STOURPORT

PETTY SESSIONS At these Sessions on Monday, before Charles Harrison Esq, **Edward Higgs**, boatman, was brought up in the custody of Superintendent Stanton, charged with having, on the 22nd October last, stolen a pair of black trousers and a waistcoat, the property of **Joseph Dark**, captain of a barge belonging to Messrs Danks and Sanders. He was further charged with stealing a bag containing one pair of shoes, two shirts, two pair of stockings and a towel from the same vessel, the property of **Maurice Bishop** of Bewdley. Prisoner absconded, and was apprehended at Great Bridge. Committed for trial on both charges.

103 December 1 1866

POLICE INTELLIGENCE

A TRIPLE CHARGE **Thomas Harris**, a boatman, was charged with being drunk, and also on suspicion of indecently assaulting and robbing a female in the Barbourne Road on Wednesday afternoon. A boy named Franklin saw the prisoner and a woman together in the Tything. Both of them were drunk. Mrs Taylor saw prisoner put his hand in the woman's pocket, but could not say whether he took anything out. Several people were near at the time. Mr Richard Minor of St Clement Street said he was near the Swan Inn on the day named, when he saw Mrs Garland and the prisoner together. Witness fetched a fly and took Mrs Garland home. PC Hodges took the prisoner in custody. Nothing was missing but a brooch. The wife and the brother of prisoner stated that Mrs Garland's son had told them that he did not intend to appear against him as all the things had been found. Mr Power considered there was no charge of robbery, but it was merely a drunken freak. Fined 5s and expenses.

104 December 15 1866

REDDITCH

PETTY SESSIONS At these Sessions on Wednesday, before the Rev G R Gray (chairman), H Milward and J Smith Esqs, Mr Joseph Morby charged **Thomas Collis**, boatman for Mr Dixon, corn dealer of Tardebigge, with being on trespass in pursuit of game at the parish of Alvechurch on the 4th inst. Case dismissed, complainant paying 8s costs.

105 January 5 1867

WORCESTERSHIRE EPIPHANY SESSIONS

PLEADED GUILTY **Edward Higgs**, aged 20, boatman, to stealing a pair of trousers and waistcoat, the property of **Joseph Darke**, at Lower Mitton on the 23rd of October. Three months' hard labour.

106 January 12 1867

MAN DROWNED On Thursday morning, a boatman went to the City Police Station and gave information of the discovery of the body of a man in Atkin's pond (near the Diglis locks on the Severn). The hands of the poor fellow had been entirely eaten away, probably by rats. The body

has not yet been identified. An inquest was held on Thursday, when after hearing the evidence of **Sidney Burrow**, who found the body, a verdict of "Accidentally drowned" was returned. The body is presumed to be that of a man who was drowned at Bewdley several months ago.

107 July 20 1867

UPTON-ON-SEVERN

PETTY SESSIONS **John Price**, boatman of Upton-on-Severn, appeared on bail to answer a charge of fraudulently obtaining alms under the Vagrancy Act sec 4 at Upton-on-Severn. Mr Cawley defended. The evidence of the Rev R Lawson, as taken on the previous hearing, having been read over, and William Manton, Inspector of the Detective department at Birmingham, examined, prisoner was discharged with a reprimand.

108 July 27 1867

WORCESTERSHIRE SUMMER ASSIZES, CITY PRISONERS

CHARGE OF STEALING COAL **Thomas Holloway**, boatman, was indicted for stealing 1 3/4 cwt of coal, the property of Mr Edmund Lane, on the 4th instant. Mr Motteram prosecuted ; Mr Watkins defended. For the prosecution, a watchman named Benjamin Pope, in the employ of Mr Lane, who is a coal dealer of Lowesmoor Wharf, stated that on the 4th inst some coal was marked belonging to prosecutor in consequence of the great loss Mr Lane had sustained previously. On the above evening, witness was watching his master's coal, and at about half past nine o'clock he saw prisoner come to his stable on the Wharf. Soon after, prisoner was seen to put some coal into his cart, and was proceeding away when witness went up to him and charged him with taking his master's coal. On witness looking into the cart, a piece of coal that witness had marked was found there. Prisoner said, in answer to witness, that someone had planned it on him, and they had got a spite against him. Cross-examined by Mr Watkins : Prisoner had a stack of coal of his own on the Wharf near the prosecutor's. Witness's reason for watching prisoner was from a suspicion that he had that prisoner had taken some coal on a previous occasion. He had no personal spite against Holloway. PC Harvey, the officer who took the prisoner into custody, corroborated the previous witness's evidence as to finding the coal on prisoner's cart, and to seeing the mark on the coal that had been put by Mr Lane's direction. Mr Lane was called, but his evidence only went to show that the witness Pope was employed to watch the coal, and that he had been a watchman on the Wharf for 14 years. Witnesses were called as to character, and the prisoner received a good one from people who had employed him. The jury were unable to agree on a verdict, and were locked up for an hour ; but on being called into Court acquitted the prisoner, expressing their opinion that no imputation whatever rested upon the witness Pope.

109 December 7 1867

DROITWICH

COUNTY COURT A sitting of this court was held on Monday. Most of the cases were settled. The following were committed for not complying with the orders of the court :- **Joseph Price**, bargeman ; Wintowe Harris and John Harris, labourers, seven days each at the suit of Mrs Harriet Cross.

110 April 28 1868

SUSPICIOUS DEATH AT WEST BROMWICH About half past eight o'clock on the morning of the 4th inst, a little girl named Ellen Pitchford, aged eleven, the daughter of Jonas Pitchford, an engine driver living in Witton Street, Darlaston, was sent by her mother to Messrs Lloyds, Old Park Colliery, to take her father his breakfast and dinner. When she arrived there, her father reminded her of an untruth she had told during the week, saying, "Ellen, you know what I told you ; unless you humble yourself, I told you I should correct you this morning with the rod". The little girl thereupon burst into tears, and as she seemed very penitent her father allowed her to go without punishing her. He then continued at his work, but at half past five o'clock in the afternoon, on

arriving at his home, he was surprised by hearing from his wife that his daughter had not returned. He at once made his way to Portobello, thinking that his child might have gone there to see her aunt, but this was not the case. A diligent search was then made, but no tidings could be gained concerning the child. Day after day passed, relatives were written to, a description of the child was advertised, and the walls of the neighbourhood were placarded with bills offering a reward for any information concerning her ; but not until Saturday last did anything come to light, and on that day the parents of the child received intelligence that their daughter had been found drowned. About half past six o'clock on the morning of the 18th inst, **William Stokes**, a boatman, was travelling with a loaded boat along the canal at Stone Cross, West Bromwich, when he found the dead body of Ellen Pitchford in the water. He got it out, and from the fact that it was covered in mud, he judged that it had been in the water some time. The deceased was seen after she left the Old Park Colliery going along the Walsall Road by Moses Parkes, a buckle maker living at King's Hill, Walsall Road, and to him she appeared quite well and cheerful. She also, after leaving the colliery, purchased a pound of oatmeal, as her mother had told her to do. How she got to the spot where her body was found at present remains a mystery. It was a place she was a perfect stranger to, and one which she had never visited before. This fact has excited some suspicion, which is shared by the father of the child, who is of opinion that the deceased never got into the water of her own accord. On Monday, an inquiry into the circumstances attending the death of the unfortunate child was opened at the Stone Cross Inn, Stone Cross, and the above facts having been proved by the evidence of several witnesses, the coroner said that he did not think the ends of justice would be satisfied unless they had an adjournment, in order that the body might be thoroughly examined by a surgeon, and evidence obtained as to how the wounds which were found on the child's body were caused. The jury coincided in the coroner's views, and the inquest was then formally adjourned until today (Friday).

111 May 9 1868

TEWKESBURY

DROWNED An inquest was held at the Town Hall on Monday by Mr C Moore, coroner, on the body of **James Holland**, aged 14, son of **James Holland**, boatman, who deposed that deceased assisted him in working a boat for Messrs Rice and Co. The lad left his home after supper on Sunday night, about half past eight, to sleep in the boat, which was moored at the Quay, and he did not see him again alive. James Dwyer, a lad, deposed to finding a cap in the water near the boat on Sunday night, which he took home. **William Turner**, boatman, said that on Sunday night deceased passed him on his way to the boat. In the morning he was missed, and witness searched for the body, which he found in the water close to the boat. He should say deceased slipped off the boat into the water as he went on board. The coroner summed up, and the jury returned a verdict of "Found drowned". The witness Dwyer was reprimanded by the coroner for not raising an alarm when he found the cap in the water.

112 May 9 1868

BROMSGROVE

PETTY SESSIONS **William Jones alias Walker** was charged with stealing a coat value 20s, the property of **William Dayhouse**, in April 1867 at Stoke. Mr Marshall appeared for prisoner. Prosecutor is a boatman living at Worcester, and on the 30th March 1867 left his boat at Kingswinford in charge of the prisoner, who worked for him. A fortnight afterwards he saw his boat at Worcester, but prisoner had left it and had taken his (prosecutor's) coat with him. About the month of October following, he saw prisoner with a boat going in the direction of Birmingham, and saw him jump from the boat and run away. On entering the cabin, he found the lost coat by the side of the bed, and delivered it to the parish constable, Stokes. PC Beech received prisoner in his custody from Worcester gaol on May 2nd 1868 ; and on charging him with the offence, received the reply, "I did not steal it, I had it on and went away to look for a better situation". Prisoner now said, "I had the coat, but intended for him to have it again". Committed for trial at the Sessions.

The same prisoner was further charged with obtaining the sum of £1 18s 3d by false pretences from Mr Benjamin Stable of Oldbury, the money of Mr Charles Beesley. Remanded for a week to obtain further evidence.

113 January 9 1869

TREAT TO THE PARENTS OF THE RAGGED SCHOOL CHILDREN On the last evening of the old year, the Severn Side Ragged School teachers gave the parents of the children a tea, at which more than 100 attended. The evening passed in the most interesting manner, the meeting being addressed by the rector of the parish (St Clement's), the Rev F G Lugard ; the curate (the Rev H Taylor) and the male teachers. So pleasant had the evening been that at half past nine o'clock, the time to break up, the people seemed unwilling to go. The assembly was, therefore, prolonged for half an hour by holding a prayer meeting. This annual and interesting gathering of the most orderly kind is entirely promoted and supported by the teachers – working men and women – who, besides giving their time to teach their ragged flock with a zeal and love rarely excelled, subscribe during the year to the fund for the purpose of treating the parents and winning them to a new course of life. The Severn Side Ragged School is connected with the Watermen's Church, and is held there. On Sunday last there were crammed into it 135 scholars and 14 teachers.

114 January 9 1869

WORCESTERSHIRE QUARTER SESSIONS

STEALING FOWLS AT HANBURY **William King alias Williams**, 26, boatman, was indicted for stealing eight tame fowls, the property of John Wilson, at Hanbury on December 9th. Mr Clay prosecuted ; prisoner was undefended. PC Bannister saw prisoner, in company with another man, coming along a bridle road in the direction of Walmer, and one of them, when they were about fifty yards from him, said, "Here, take it a bit". The policeman then concealed himself in the hedge, and on the men coming up, he made his appearance and asked them what they had, when a bag was dropped. He arrested prisoner and the other man ran away. It was discovered that the bag contained fowls, and the prosecutor identified them as having been stolen from him. In defence prisoner said he did not steal the fowls or know that they were stolen. He only helped to carry the bag without knowing what it contained. The jury found him guilty, and he was sentenced to twelve months' hard labour.

STEALING HAY AT SHRAWLEY **Joseph Strain** and Frederick Hughes, on bail, were indicted for stealing seven trusses of hay, the property of Thomas Timbs, at Shrawley on November 3rd. Mr Griffiths prosecuted ; Mr Godson defended Strain. The case for the prosecution was that prosecutor, a farmer, employed one of the prisoners to truss some hay. On going to see how he was doing his work, he saw both prisoners carrying trusses to a boat on the canal. Hughes was a hay trusser and Strain was a boatman. Prosecutor asked Hughes how much hay was gone, and he answered none. Prosecutor accused the prisoners of taking the hay, and he went to the boat, where he found seven trusses of hay and some of another sort. He had given them no authority to remove the hay. The evidence left the case in doubt, and the prisoners being given a good character, they were acquitted.

ALLEGED HOUSEBREAKING AT OLDBURY **David White**, 35, boatman, was indicted for breaking into a warehouse at Oldbury, and stealing a boat line, hand saw and other articles. Mr Godson prosecuted. Not guilty.

115 January 23 1869

DROITWICH BOROUGH MAGISTRATES' OFFICE, THURSDAY JANUARY 21

DRUNKENNESS **Caroline**, the wife of **Daniel Price**, bargeman, was summoned on the information of PC Martin for being drunk in High Street and creating a disturbance of the peace, on Monday the 18th inst. Fined 5s and 10s 6d costs, or ten days' hard labour. Allowed a week to pay.

116 January 23 1869

BEWDLEY ELECTION PETITION Bewdley had the honour on Tuesday of receiving the Right Honourable Colin Blackburn, one of her Majesty's Judges – an honour never before conferred upon the little town, whose inhabitants will, doubtless, not omit to hand down the fact to the succeeding generation. Bewdley has also had the further honour (if it can be called one) of being the third borough on the roll of Election Petitions, which led to the visit of Justice Blackburn on Tuesday afternoon. There are few places in which party feeling runs so high as it does in Bewdley where, in fact, not content with running, it gallops upon occasions, and has no notion of allowing itself to be reined in. Those who know what the town is on election days will need no description to recall to mind the varied incidents which attend on such periods ; the excitement on Tuesday did not at all equal that at election times, but it was a day to be remembered for all that. There was some expectation of Mr Justice Blackburn arriving on Monday, on which day the petition was the one absorbing topic of conversation within and animated discussion out of doors. In the streets stood the free and independent until nightfall, sagely weighing the pros and cons of the matter ; every second person you met appeared to have been subpoenaed, even a worthy brother of the quill was summoned to attend for some not very lucid reason ; “the George” was in a flutter of excitement from the proprietor to the chambermaid and boots ; “the Sheaf” was similarly situated ; reporters had arrived from far and near ; professional shorthand writers had come from London ; the police were enveloped in an air of mystery, as though they could, if they chose, deliver themselves of some intelligence which, “from information they had received” would settle the petition and all concerned in it on the spot and, as they paced the pebbly streets, “bitterly thought of the morrow” ; every solicitor had his clientele ever present at his office ; and everything and everybody seemed to point to the fact that the place was on the eve of a grave event. The fallacy of the proverb that “early birds pick up the worms” was proven by the fact that those witnesses who were in attendance at the Town Hall at nine were at their wit's end for employment until three o'clock, when the learned Judge arrived from London via Worcester. Unaccustomed to the sight of so eminent a lawgiver as Mr Justice Blackburn, some of the more juvenile of the population had, there is reason to believe, pictured to themselves a spectacle of no small degree of brilliancy ; and it was, therefore, with very mingled feelings that they saw step out of the railway carriage a pleasant looking gentleman with nothing about him, as regarded his raiment, to betoken the judicial character of his office. His Lordship was received on the platform by the Mayor of Bewdley (Whittington Landon Esq) and the Town Clerk (W N Marcy Esq) who conducted him to a carriage, in which he was driven to the town.

In front of the building which does duty as the Town Hall, and the interior of which, by the way, has lately been much improved, a crowd had gathered to witness his Lordship's arrival. Considering that it was permitted to cool its heels in the street for about an hour before being admitted to the hall, the crowd was decidedly a good humoured one ; but certain reporters for the Birmingham and Worcester and other journals were at a loss to know why they were compelled to remain for half an hour contemplating the exterior of the hall, while others were granted free ingress and egress. Considering the limited quantity of space at their disposal, the authorities had made very good arrangements for the accommodation of the reporters, immediately below whom seats were placed for a few ladies. As the more prominent partisans of each party appeared, the crowd outside yelled at or cheered them ; otherwise there was very little or no manifestation of feeling.

It was four o'clock when his Lordship took his seat on the bench, with the Mayor and Town Clerk on his right ; and the proceedings were at once commenced. Mr Fitzjames Stephen QC and with him the Hon E Chandos Leigh and Mr Sturge (instructed by Messrs Chilton, Burton, Yeates and Hart, the London agents for Messrs W and A F Morgan of Birmingham) appeared in support of the petition ; and the sitting member, Sir Richard A Glass, was represented by Mr Hardinge Giffard QC, and with him Mr Poland (instructed by Messrs Lawrance, Plews, Bowyer and Baker, the London agents for Mr R Acton Pardoe of Bewdley).

As was expected, the first day's proceedings consisted solely of counsel's opening speech which, in Mr Fitzjames Stephen's experienced hands, lost nothing of the effect it was meant to convey.

Uncontradicted as it was, the listener had presented to his view a series of unblushing venal acts on the part of Sir Richard Glass and his supporters, and (by inference) the exact converse as regards the Liberal Party and the Liberal candidate, for whom Mr Stephen claimed the seat. Beginning with the reception given to Sir Richard Glass when he arrived at Bewdley last July – the cannon firing and the dispensing of refreshments on Mr Pardoe's lawn – the learned counsel, in a speech of great length, proceeded to detail instance after instance in which he sought to show that Sir Richard had exercised his well known liberality in such a manner as to lead one to suppose that the hon gentleman was never easy when he was not “treating” someone or another. Revellings which will happen at election time were sarcastically commented upon ; to Sir Richard Glass was imputed the heinous offence of having once sung a comic song ; Mr Webster and Mr Burnish were half reminded that *un mauvais quart d'heure de Rabelais* was in store for them when they should be placed in the witness box ; and the reference to certain ladies who, from the best of motives, had endeavoured to seek out and send home some *debauchees*, was put in such a manner as to make it appear what it hardly was – a kindly intentioned act.

When the learned counsel had finished his opening speech, which occupied him about an hour and a half, the proceedings were adjourned until Wednesday, when evidence was taken.

An amusing episode of a former Bewdley Election may be recorded here, as it came out during the subsequent proceedings before a Committee of the House of Commons about 20 years ago. Several Bewdley voters whose allegiance to the Liberal cause was considered dubious were spirited away, a week before the election, to “fresh woods and pastures green” at Stanford Bridge and, not to put too fine a point on it, were kept under vigilant surveillance until after the polling. They amused themselves by day in various ways – fishing, &c – and at night there was, of course, a jollification at the hostelry. That an unlimited supply of grog was dispensed was shown by an elderly witness who, when before the Committee, was asked by counsel if he could tell how many glasses of brandy and water he drank on an average on each evening of his sojourn at Stanford Bridge. The witness hesitated, and thought he could not remember. Pressed for an answer, he at length confessed to having drunk *about* eight glasses of grog at a sitting ; and further explaining how it was he remembered the number, he said it was his custom, when on a drinking bout, to unfasten one of the buttons on his waistcoat after each glass. He knew he had eight buttons on that garment, and on examining it at night he found every button undone.

MR JUSTICE BLACKBURN took his seat at four o'clock.

The petition forming the basis of the enquiry having been read,

His Lordship said it was the general rule and a convenient course in cases of scrutiny as well as corrupt practices, as in this instance, to complete the case of corrupt practices first.

Mr Fitzjames Stephen replied that he was going to propose that course. He might as well at once dispose of the scrutiny for the present by observing that, besides claiming the seat to which he had a right, it was a very great object with Mr Lloyd to challenge investigation, to give the other side an opportunity, by offering recriminatory evidence if they were so disposed, of testing the propriety of his conduct. The learned counsel proceeded to open the case with regard to corrupt practices, and said he would at once come to the facts, which he was sorry to say were numerous. The candidates for the borough at the last election were Sir Richard Glass and Mr Lloyd. Sir Richard Glass, he believed, had not been previously connected with the town, but was introduced to it by his friends. He came down here in July in order to pursue his canvass. The periods of the time to which he (Mr Stephen) should have to refer were the early part of July, slightly to August and September, and considerably the latter part of October and the early part of November down to the day of polling, which took place on the 17th. The charges which he had to submit to his Lordship's consideration were :- First, that Sir Richard Glass personally and by his agents corruptly treated various electors of the town, and that in a most determined and systematic manner. Secondly, that there was a corrupt proceeding with regard to the employment of a large number of persons to act as watchers. He should contend that the circumstances under which those persons were employed were such as to show that the proceeding was colorable and corrupt, that in fact it was a means of bribing voters.

Thirdly, he charged that illegal conduct on the part of Sir Richard Glass's agents took place in respect of a large number of voters who were brought, some from Bristol, and others from Gloucester. They were in the employ of Mr Danks, who he believed was a large barge owner, having a considerable number of bargemen and boatmen of various kinds in his employment in that town. The substance of the charge was that the men not only had their travelling expenses paid but were treated on their way to the town. Fourthly and lastly, he charged several acts of direct bribery by the agents of Sir Richard Glass. These were the charges he had to press against Sir Richard Glass, and which if he succeeded in proving all or any of them would render the gentleman's election void, whatever might be their success in the fifth part of the matter, namely the scrutiny. He would proceed to state the facts with regard to treating and the other matters he had mentioned. Sir Richard Glass came to the town in order to commence his canvass on July 6th, and on the evening of that day he went to the house of Mr Acton Pardoe, a solicitor practising in the town, and one of Sir Richard's paid agents. It appeared there was a sort of reception of Sir Richard, a large number of persons were present, and quantities of beer and other refreshments were provided on Mr Pardoe's lawn. He was informed that matters went so far that a barrel of beer was breached, and that he alleged was the first case of treating. It was impossible to suppose any other motive for the provision of refreshments in that manner, for a large promiscuous assembly of people, than the desire to promote Sir R Glass's popularity and influence voters in his favour. After these proceedings had gone on for a considerable time, some of the party adjourned to the Peacock Inn, and from someone in Mr Pardoe's house a sovereign found its way to the inn, and was spent in beer by the persons present on that occasion. The same evening, another party of Mr Pardoe's guests went to the Pack Horse in company with Dr Webster, afterwards a prominent supporter of Sir Richard Glass, and a member of his committee. Dr Webster, whom he hoped to have the pleasure of seeing in the box, treated various persons with beer. That was the beginning of Sir Richard Glass's connection with the town, and he could not help saying the manner in which it proceeded was very well worthy of such a beginning. On the following day, July 7th, a meeting of Sir Richard Glass's supporters was held in the Town Hall, and the proceedings were of the usual kind. A committee was formed for the purpose of promoting Sir Richard's election, which consisted of the following gentlemen :- Messrs Giles Shaw (chairman), John Bury, W Boucher, W H Chellingworth, Gardener (who was also a paid agent), E R Nicholas, R Acton Pardoe (another paid agent), S Price, J Tart, C Webster, J Blundell, S Crane, W A Crowther, W D Dance, J Hinton, G Humphreys, H Jeffs, S Lamb, W Mytton, T Radford, J C Rogers, Shaw, F D Wright and Whittington Landon, the present Mayor, who also took part in some of these transactions. On the 8th, Sir Richard commenced his canvass, and went among other places to the establishment of Mr Price, tanner, a member of his committee and a strong supporter. He went there to canvass the men in Mr Price's employ, which, of course, was a perfectly legitimate operation, but other persons, who were much his inferiors in point of legitimate powers of persuasion, but were not less persuasive in a way of their own, went to a neighbouring public house, got two cans of beer, and brought them into a yard which formed part of the tanyard. Mr Price's men were plied with beer on the one hand, and on the other hand their master suggested to them to vote for Sir Richard Glass. Therefore he (Mr Stephen) suggested it was with the candidate's consent and approbation the beer was provided. In the course of the same day, Sir Richard went to the Star and Garter, where was a man named Gillam who had broken his arm. Struck with the man's misfortune, he gave him half a sovereign. That was an act which might be put down to good nature and charity, but he (the learned counsel) was informed that Sir Richard also gave ten shillings to the landlord to be spent in beer. On another occasion at the Wheatsheaf, there was treating going on and brandy being drunk. Sir Richard objected to the brandy, considering it was not of proper quality, and sent out for a better kind which, according to the speaker's informant, met with universal approval. After July, he did not rightly know what became of Sir Richard – probably he was shooting or otherwise amusing himself – but he did not appear upon the scene until a somewhat later period. One or two circumstances occurred during August and September to which his Lordship's attention might be directed. In Stourport there was a Working Men's Conservative Election Committee, the chairman of which was a person

by the name of Taylor, who was not, he believed, a working man. Mr Taylor appeared to have given a supper at the Red Cow, at which a considerable number of people were present, and he paid for it to Paget, the landlord. In September, a society was formed which was called the Conservative Working Men's Association. Members were to subscribe 6d per week, and honorary members half a guinea a year, and the directors were the same, he believed, or nearly so, as the election committee. To speak plainly, the association, he said, was nothing more nor less than an election club for the purpose of promoting Sir Richard Glass's election. It was inaugurated by a very splendid entertainment, which took place at the house of Mr Rogers, who took a considerable part in these matters at Stourport. A large number of people were present, and every kind of refreshment was given away. In fact it was treating upon a large scale, and people were there who were likely to be influenced by the entertainment. If he succeeded in establishing what he had stated, he was entitled to say such conduct admitted of but one construction, for it was inconceivable that any other motives could be alleged than those which stared one in the face in connection with proceedings of that kind. They now came to October and November, and he should be able, he thought, to lay before his Lordship evidence of a general system of treating which extended over the whole of the town, which produced the greatest possible harm, and which he could describe in no other language than wholesale corruption of the grossest kind. Treats were given at various public houses, he had the names of 32 or 33 of them. Night after night there was what was called a free and easy at one or more of these public houses, where people drank and smoked as much as they pleased until a certain time, when a tap was stopped, and anybody who wanted drink afterwards had to pay for it. While this was going on in the kitchen or tap room, in another room were members of Sir Richard Glass's committee, and he should show that they gave orders with regard to the amount of liquor to be supplied. On some occasions, Sir Richard Glass himself was present, and actually sent for persons out of the tap room to canvass them for their votes. If he succeeded in establishing this, he should submit with very great confidence that these were cases of as direct personal treating on the part of Sir Richard Glass and his agents and committee men as it was possible to imagine. The effect upon the voters they could only conjecture, but he should show that many persons who afterwards voted for Sir Richard were present on those occasions. He could show also that not only did large numbers of men get drunk, but numbers of women and boys also. Two ladies of the family of Mr Shaw submitted to the pain which it must have been to them in going into one of the public houses and remonstrating with the women. It would be his duty to put those ladies into the box. These treats were direct bribes to the landlords who gave them. A certain number of the houses were kept by women, who of course could not vote, but with regard to the rest he had this result – of 32 landlords who had votes, one voted for Lloyd, two did not vote at all, and no less than 29 voted for Glass. Anticipating for a moment the question of bribery, a man of the name of Griffin declared a distinct promise was held out to him that, if he voted for Glass, he should have a “do” at his house, as it was called. It was said, “Your's is the last, but it shall be the best ; you shall draw a hogshhead”. He would hand in a list of houses as to which he should be obliged to give evidence, but he would select three of the most important, and shortly state some of the circumstances connected with the treats which took place at these houses. The first was the Rifleman, at which a treat took place on October 27th. A great variety of people were drinking there, and two members of Sir Richard Glass's committee, Mr Gardner and Mr Boucher – Mr Gardner being a paid agent, which was a matter of very great importance – were in the better room. The people remained there drinking until the tap was ordered to be stopped by a person of the name of Burnish, clerk to Mr Pardoe, Sir Richard's principal agent, of whose movements he should have a good deal to say. On the 31st October at the Waggon and Horses a similar occurrence took place. Mr Boucher and Mr Gardner were again in the parlour, other committee men were in and out, and Sir Richard Glass himself was present. He remained there a considerable time, and as he was leaving he canvassed a man by the name of Goodwin. There was evidence also of his having made a statement on that occasion, and the Court would hear whether he admitted it or not. If he did, it would leave very little doubt as to the whole occurrence. The statement was this : “Drink away, boys. It's the Whigs want to stop you from having your ale. You may do what you like till the writ comes down, you

cannot after that". It was an extraordinary statement to make, but there was one remarkable circumstance about it – the writ did come down on the 12th November, and after that date, although there were isolated cases of treating, there was no systematic treating. One knew from prolonged experience that people did get extraordinary notions into their minds as to what the law of the land was, especially under exciting circumstances. The last of the detailed instances he should mention was an occasion on which Sir Richard Glass was again present at the Coach and Horses on November 4th. The same sort of scene took place. Sir Richard was in a room apart from the general public, and he sent for a man named Southan, whom he canvassed. Without saying it was a corrupt practice, the speaker was instructed that Sir Richard was so far condescending on that occasion as to enliven the proceedings by singing a comic song. There were a great many other instances in which treating would be proved, but he saw no occasion to detail them in opening. The remarkable point with regard to all the instances was that he should give evidence to show that the parties who drank the beer paid nothing for it. It was obvious that somebody paid, and there could be no great doubt as to what the objects must have been for which the payments were made. There would no doubt be a certain degree of difficulty in this matter, but his Lordship was armed with extensive powers, and if they carried the case to a certain point, whether or not his Lordship should pursue the matter further with a view to his report was a subject entirely for his own consideration. He might sum up these matters very shortly by saying they would be able to directly connect the treats with Sir Richard Glass himself, or with his recognised agents, or with other persons, paid agents. The specific facts they had to rely on were these :- On the 27th October, Messrs Boucher and Gardner, one a paid agent, were present at the Rifleman ; on the 30th October, Dr Webster and Mr Herbert Pardoe, son of Mr Acton Pardoe, were present at the Pack Horse ; on the 31st October, Sir Richard himself, Mr Boucher and Mr Gardner were present at the Waggon and Horses, and on the same evening Sir R Glass, Mr Gardner and another gentleman named Berry (also a committee man) were present at the Rising Sun. At the Blue Ball, the same evening, were gentlemen who were known not to be frequenters of such a place ; but the most remarkable of all the instances of agency to which he had to refer in connection with public house treating was that of Mr Burnish, Mr Pardoe's clerk, who was the secretary of the Bewdley Working Men's Conservative Association. Before going further, he would mention that he should be able to adduce clear evidence of payment at the Waggon and Horses. Messrs Boucher and Gardner were seen handling money ; they were afterwards talking with the landlady, Mrs Strange ; a score was rubbed off the slate, and all the circumstances when put together would distinctly prove that payment was made for the treat. He returned to the proceedings of Mr Burnish, who was at the Rifleman on the 27th October, at the Pack Horse on the 30th, the Rising Sun on the 31st, the Acorn on November 2nd, the Old Mug House on the 4th, the Dog Wheel on the 5th, the Cock and Magpie on the 9th, the Labour in Vain – rather appropriately – on the same day, at the Star and Garter on the 11th, shortly before the election at the Black Boy, and at the Hop Pole on the 15th. At one place he was distinctly heard to give an order for several gallons, which the people were to have. He was the man who stopped the liquor, and after that everybody who wanted more had to pay for it. At one of the public houses – the Waggon and Horses, he thought – complaints were made that the liquor was not supplied quickly enough, whereupon one of the persons present went to the landlord, who went to the committee men and returned with various sums of money, which were laid out in drink in the course of the evening. Besides the systematic treating to which he had referred, there were various minor treats which were of less practical importance, but still had their weight. For instance, there were breakfasts at various places. On the polling day, a breakfast was given to a number of letter carriers by the postmaster. They were ten voters, and they went straight to the poll and all voted for Glass. There was again a breakfast given on the polling day at Mr Pardoe's house. His Lordship would hear under what circumstances these breakfasts took place, and attach to them whatever weight he thought fit. Of course a great deal would turn upon the class of persons invited. If a person invited a large number of men to his house for the purpose of breakfasting just before the poll whom he would not think of inviting upon any other occasion, the construction they must put upon such conduct was sufficiently obvious. Coming to the second head of the charge, with regard to the

watchers, it appeared from public records that this was a sort of Bewdley institution. In Power and Rodwell's reports, there was a report of a former election, which contained a resolution of the Committee condemning the excessive employment of watchers. On account of the great treating, watchers were employed to prevent people from being treated. There certainly was great treating on this occasion, but why Sir Richard Glass's party should want watchers to keep men out of their own public houses he could not understand. A very large number of watchers were employed to go about the town. He should be able to prove there were between 100 and 200, a large proportion of whom were voters, and voted for Glass. His Lordship was aware that under the Reform Act, the 30th and 31st Vic, c 102, no elector employed for reward within six months of an election should be entitled to vote. If he should so vote, he would be guilty of a misdemeanour. The learned counsel read the clause, and said the effect would of course be that if a man hired as a watcher for reward did vote he would be guilty of a misdemeanour, and the person who illegally hired a man with a view to his voting would himself be guilty of a misdemeanour, because he would be accessory to it. Inasmuch as the act of voting was illegal, and the act of paying in order that a man might vote was illegal, it would raise the strongest possible presumption that the payment was in point of fact a wrongful payment, and therefore bribery. It was by no means necessary that money should pass, because the words were :- "shall have been retained, hired or employed for reward". If a person gave men to understand by his conduct, by the orders he gave them, that they were to be paid for what they did, although he might not make an express bargain with them, he still retained them for reward within the meaning of the section. He had to show such conduct on the part of Sir Richard Glass or persons on his committee as would reasonably be regarded by parties employed as holding out to them a prospect of payment. He had to show also that the number of persons employed and the circumstances of their employment were such as to raise the presumption that the employment was not for the legitimate purpose of necessary service, but for the illegitimate purpose of influencing voters. He proposed to make out that the number of persons employed as watchers was larger than required for any necessary purpose, and he said that, the intention being an illegal one, the employment would amount to bribery. There were a variety of circumstances connected with this employment of watchers which would tend to support those views. There were, as he had said, a very large number of watchers, some being voters and some non voters, but most of them in very much the same class of life. The bulk of them were men whom it would be most unreasonable to expect would give their services night after night without being paid for their time and labour. There was great difficulty in getting evidence in transactions of this kind, but he should be able to show that non voters who were employed as watchers were paid 3s for a day's and 5s for a night's watching. Certainly one would say, under the circumstances, that that was a very reasonable payment. He was able to show with regard to one voter that he was paid for what he did. The men perambulated the streets night after night, doing work for Sir Richard Glass, and it was in evidence that they went for payment to the Malt Shovel and Mr Pardoe's house. They had only received the summary of Sir Richard Glass's election accounts that afternoon ; and from that summary it appeared that the total expenses amounted to £759 5s, and the largest item, £207 7s 9d was for watchers, messengers, &c. He could not, of course, lay the whole matter before his Lordship ; but he would throw on the other side the burden of proving that the £207 odd was a legal expenditure. When the non voters went to be paid, there was a degree of mystery observed which was certainly suspicious. They were ushered into a room where were two of the persons who had been a good deal mixed up in the various transactions. By them, or between them, was a man in a mask ; and when the non voter held forth his hand, the man in a mask put 8s into it. He submitted that that gentleman ought to come there without his mask and tell them all about it. That circumstance tended to show a consciousness of illegality. He now came to the next head, respecting Danks's men. These were people employed in the navigation of the Severn, and they were brought up from Gloucester and Bristol, their expenses being paid, which itself was irregular, and they were treated, and afterwards voted for Glass. The steps by which he connected this transaction with Sir Richard Glass were these. The men were in the employment of Mr Danks, and he would show that Mr Danks took a warm interest in the election on the side of Sir Richard Glass, and canvassed with

him. Two men of the names of Rowley and Hill, poor men, and doubtless authorised by Mr Danks, brought these people money to pay their fares back, and several of them received 10s each. That was the transaction on which he relied under the third head, and he now came to the last division, which was the subject of bribery. As in the case of treating, he would direct attention only to the more prominent cases. The first he would mention was a corrupt payment of rates which, as his Lordship knew, was by section 49 of the Reform Act made illegal. He would prove that Mr Giles Shaw, chairman of Sir R Glass's committee, paid £1 to a man named Moseley to pay his own rate and the rates of other persons. Moseley voted for Sir Richard Glass. Another case was that of a man of the name of Hamer. A Mr Fowler was heard to offer Mr Hamer £5 for his vote, and he would bring forward the persons who heard the offer made, and other corroborative circumstances. He would challenge his friend to put Hamer into the box. There was another case, that of a man of the name of Fort. Mr Taylor, the gentleman who gave the supper at the Red Cow, canvassed him for a considerable time, and at last he offered him 10s to vote for Sir Richard Glass. He should prove to his Lordship that Taylor paid the 10s on the nomination day. Fort voted for Lloyd, after receiving the 10s. A person of the name of Hunt was canvassed by Mr C Pountney, who urged him not to vote at all if he would not vote for Sir Richard Glass, laid a £5 note on the floor, and told him to pick it up. Hunt did pick up the £5, and showed it to his father immediately after, who would corroborate the statement that he was in possession of £5 at the time named. 4s was given to a person by Miss Nicholas, a daughter of Mr Nicholas, who was a member of Sir Richard Glass's committee. The money was paid after the election, but the lady previously enquired whether the man had voted for Sir Richard Glass. There were some other cases which would come out in the evidence, and he would not trouble his Lordship with the details ; but he confidently anticipated that if he established the case as he had opened it, the allegations of the petition would be fully substantiated.

Proof of formal matters connected with the petition was given, and the Court adjourned.

117 January 30 1869

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH POLICE INTELLIGENCE TUESDAY JANUARY 22

EMBEZZLEMENT William Broadwell, waterman, was charged with embezzling 19s 9d, the property of Messrs Rice, Son and Co, his masters. From the evidence of Mr R Graham, it appeared the prisoner had altered several canal freight tickets &c, to the amount of 19s 9d over what he had paid and had been allowed. The magistrates remanded the prisoner for further evidence.

118 January 30 1869

BEWDLEY ELECTION PETITION

CONCLUSION OF THE ENQUIRY We resume our report of Friday afternoon's proceedings before Mr Justice Blackburn.

John Davis, labourer, Wribbenhall, said : I voted for Mr Lloyd. I was asked for my vote by Sir R Glass, Mr Gardener and Mr Jackson being with him. Jackson came a second time alone and said, "How is it you won't promise your vote to Sir R Glass?" He took out 3d and gave it to me to get a pint of drink.

John Paget, under gardener to Mr Hemming, said : Jackson asked me in the beginning of November to go down to the Coach and Horses, saying there was a meeting there and drink was to be had. I did not go.

Alexander Falconer, Bewdley, said : I was canvassed by Mr Bury for Sir R Glass. William Jackson invited me to meet some friends at the Coach and Horses, but I did not go.

Mr Marcy, town clerk, produced the accounts of election expenses for Sir Richard Glass. He had not looked through them. He had also received the return of Mr Lloyd's expenses.

Mr Stephen remarked that there was no detailed statement in Sir R Glass's return of the persons to whom (?£219) was paid for watchers, messengers, &c.

The Judge said that where payments were made in such a peculiar manner, it was important to show what they were for.

Mr Giffard observed that there was an item of the same kind in Mr Lloyd's accounts.

His Lordship : But it has not been shown that they were made in a mysterious way. I have a great desire to see this man in the mask barefaced, and to ask him a few questions.

Mr Stephen said they could subpoena many men in wigs, but not men in masks. He proposed to strengthen the evidence as to voters watching.

Henry Hunt, examined by Mr Sturge : I saw men walking about before the election not in twos and threes. The same people were walking about all day. Charles Crump, John Crump and Edward Field are the only persons I can remember.

Joseph Darke, examined by the Hon C Leigh : I am a labourer, living in Lax Lane. I am not a voter. I saw people watching ; walking backwards and forwards in front of the voters' houses. Sometimes two were together. I know Edward Field, Benjamin Darke, James Davis, Mr Shaw's cowman, and Samuel and Adam Danby. I heard Henry Milward say he watched, but was not paid. I saw the men after the election was over standing together on the bridge, when some of the men who had not been paid wanted to know when they were going to be paid. I saw numbers of men and women about Mr Pardoe's office ; I knew some of them as watchers. Edward Field was one.

Cross-examined by Mr Giffard : Field worked for Mr Pountney two doors off.

Isaac Leverton, examined by Mr Stephen : I am a waterman in the employment of Mr Danks of Stourport. The day before the election I was going down the Bristol Channel, and got to Bristol Quay on Sunday night. A man named **Burton**, a waterman in Mr Danks's employ, was with me. We are voters for Bewdley. There were more of Mr Danks's vessels at Bristol at that time. I know **William Rowley**, who is employed by Mr Joseph Rogers. He has worked as a waterman. He came to Bristol Quay, and said he was come for one or two men from the vessels. He told Burton and others that he was come to take them to Stourport. I went with Rowley to another vessel, where two men were. One of them (Bentley) was a voter. Parminter was there. I went to the railway with Rowley and the other two men. A ticket was given me for Gloucester by one of those I was with, not Rowley. We went to Gloucester and stopped at a public house. We had some beer ; I did not see anybody pay for it. Someone in the company called for the beer. Rowley was out at the time. The same lot of us went to the railway station and remained on the platform, where one of the men gave me a ticket for Stourport. We had a drop of beer at Worcester ; I did not see any money pass. I did not pay. We arrived at Stourport that night, and the next day we voted for Sir Richard Glass. I have never voted before. I had seen Mr Rogers a month before the election, and he asked me if I had any inclination to vote. I replied that I did not wish to.

Cross-examined by Mr Giffard : I had not promised to vote for Sir R Glass. I came up and voted of my own accord.

Re-examined : I should not have come if I had not been fetched.

Richard Millington, examined by Hon C Leigh : I live at Stourport. I am a waterman in the employ of Messrs Danks and Sanders. I voted for Sir R Glass. The day before the poll I was on a vessel at Bristol with three others. Rowley came to me on the vessel, talked about the election, and asked me who I was going to vote for. I said for Sir R Glass, but added that I had no money to pay my expenses. He said he would pay my expenses if I returned it again, and I said I would. He lent me 25s altogether. I have not paid him back yet, but he has asked me for it a week ago at Stourport. I took a ticket from Bristol to Kidderminster, paying 11s 11d. There were other men with me, some of them in the same employ. Rowley was in the same train. We stopped at Gloucester and had some beer ; I paid for some. I don't know who paid for the rest ; I did not see anybody pay. Rowley stopped at Gloucester, but I did not see him at the public house there. I did not see him again until I got to Kidderminster. I paid for beer at Worcester. I arrived in Kidderminster on Monday evening, voted for Sir R Glass the next day, and returned to Bristol on Wednesday. My wages are paid by the trip, and I was paid for that voyage.

George Anderson, examined by Mr Stephen : I am clerk to Mr Crowther, agent to Sir R Glass. I sent out sixty or seventy circulars signed William Taylor respecting the establishment of a Conservative Working Men's Association. I signed them by Mr Taylor's authority, and sent them out at his request. In this circular, Taylor was described as chairman of the Working Men's

Committee. The person addressed was asked to assist in forming a Conservative Working Men's Association. There was no Working Men's Committee as far as I knew. I sent the circular because it was brought to me. I was a member of the association, and was present at some of the meetings. I was secretary. I should think the association was not intended to further the return of Sir Richard Glass. I have the rules and the accounts of the association. I had nothing to do with getting it up. Mr Rogers was president and Mr Radford was one of the vice presidents. The objects of the association were the furtherance and maintenance of Conservative principles &c. I should think that it did not seek to support Conservative principles by promoting the return of Sir Richard Glass. I never saw Sir Richard at any of the meetings. I recollect the demonstration at Mr Rogers's grounds to inaugurate the association. In the accounts produced there is £8 7s 6d, creditor, and 6d expenses. (Laughter). That was the entrance fee of G Wright refunded. (Laughter). Those are all the funds that have come to my knowledge. There is an honorary secretary. Taylor made a speech at the meeting held at the Lion on August 28th. Mr Rogers and Mr Radford were there, and some friends from Kidderminster. Taylor did not say anything about the election that I recollect.

Cross-examined by Mr Giffard : 800 or 900 persons came from Kidderminster to the demonstration on September 5th. The people from Kidderminster formed the greater proportion of the people present. Mr Wynn Knight MP and Mr Makins, candidate for Kidderminster, and Mr Clarke, representative of the Conservative and Constitutional Union in London, were there, and made speeches. The account handed in refers only to the matters which passed through my hands and not to the receipts and disbursements by the treasurer. Sir Richard Glass canvassed the voters, and those who went with him simply introduced them. I did not employ Taylor in the election and, so far as I knew, my employer did not.

Mr Stephen said he was in hopes of being able to produce the man in the mask, and if so he would ask leave to call him. Subject to that, his case was closed.

His Lordship remarked that he should not like to exclude the evidence if it was forthcoming, but a special application must be made.

Mr Giffard then addressed his Lordship in behalf of Sir Richard Glass. He commenced by referring to two statements made by Mr Stephen in his opening address. His learned friend said that at one of the public houses, Sir R Glass sang a song called "The Jolly Thieves". No attempt was made to prove it.

His Lordship concurred, and said this had no bearing on the case, but Sir R Glass did not like it to go forth that he sang "The Jolly Thieves".

Mr Giffard went on to say that not only would Sir Richard deny it, but he ventured to conjecture that there was no such song. The idea of such a song, perhaps, arose from a cartoon representing certain distinguished statesmen robbing the Irish Church, underneath being the words "Ye Jollie Thieves". It was unpleasant to a gentleman in Sir Richard Glass's position to be held up to ridicule by a master of rhetoric like his learned friend. It was also attributed to Sir R Glass that on a certain occasion he was in a public house and said, "Drink away, my boys ; you can do anything you like till the writ comes down". No attempt was made to prove this either.

His Lordship conjectured that an attempt was made to prove it by one witness, but it utterly failed.

Mr Giffard said it could not be supposed Sir Richard could make such an absurd blunder as to the state of the law. Referring to the cases which had been brought against Sir Richard, he said agency was one of the most elastic words in the English language. During an election, a candidate was surrounded by a number of persons interested in the principles he professed, and things might be done by zealous but indiscreet friends whose acts the candidate would be the first to disapprove. Sir Richard Glass came there with a determination to do nothing contrary to law. He had taken peculiar precautions ; he resolved upon the dissolution of the committee formed at the public meeting, so that no one should have authority to act who was not his duly authorised agent. So far as he was concerned he never, directly or indirectly, promised anything for a vote, or sanctioned any expenditure for treating.

His Lordship observed that there was evidence tending to show that a considerable amount of money was spent at public houses when Sir R Glass's agent or agents' clerk was present. He took it

that if there was any giving of meat and drink to voters it was a question of the amount of evidence, but it was corrupt treating if it was done with the intention to influence votes thereby. His Lordship alluded to the number of houses which were opened, and spoke of the part which Burnish had taken in the matter. If there was treating to such an extent, with the knowledge of agents, it was a fair inference to draw that it was for purposes which the legislature intended to forbid, and though the candidate might be entirely ignorant of it, yet he must take the consequences. His Lordship pointed out that there was an item in the accounts for Burnish staying at the Wheatsheaf.

Mr Giffard contested the proposition that a paid agent was presumably an agent for election purposes until it was affirmatively proved what his duty was in respect of his employer. He was anxious to contract the issues. No doubt his learned friend wished to raise new issues, but he had failed, the speaker contended, to establish those he had already raised. He could not see what the necessity for watchers was, but he was instructed that no voter was employed. Watchers were employed on the other side as well as on theirs.

His Lordship observed that this might be an ancient custom established for corrupt purposes, but continued without corrupt motive.

Mr Giffard said Mr Lloyd came to the borough a stranger as well as Sir R Glass. The last borough he was connected with was Barnstaple, respecting which something might afterwards have to be said.

His Lordship remarked that Mr Giffard had said nothing of a recriminatory charge.

Mr Giffard said he was not instructed except as to the scrutiny, and proceeded to call witnesses.

Sir Richard Attwood Glass, examined by Mr Poland, said : I am the respondent in this case. In July last year I came down to Bewdley. I came to Kidderminster, and then drove to Mr Shaw's. I had then decided – subject to the report of some of the gentlemen in the neighbourhood – to stand for Bewdley. On our way from Kidderminster we passed Mr Pardoe's. There was a crowd of people there and at other parts of the road, and they cheered. I did not know at the time it was Mr Pardoe's house. A meeting was held at the Town Hall, and I addressed the electors. A committee was appointed, but they did not act for me. I made up my mind before leaving London to conduct the election on my own responsibility, with the assistance of two or three of the most respectable solicitors I could find. I had an interview with Mr Pardoe, and explained this to him. The committee did not act for me, and I did not acknowledge them as a committee. I addressed them at Mr Pardoe's office, and explained to them that I should be glad of their support, but that I intended to canvass myself. Mr Pardoe, Mr Gardner and Mr Crowther were appointed my agents. I said to them that any legitimate expense I should pay, but that I hoped they would not incur any expense about which there could be the slightest doubt. I saw about three fourths of the electors, but I did not see many at Stourport, my presence not being acceptable. At the conclusion of my canvass I calculated on a majority of 85. About the middle of the polling day I believe I had a majority of about 120. No bribery was committed by me or my agents so far as I am aware. No such thing entered my mind. I did not pay for the articles consumed at the meetings in public houses spoken of, and I did not sanction the expenses in any meeting. I did not know of it until I heard it in court. I knew that Mr Burnish was Mr Pardoe's clerk, but I did not know that he ordered drink at public houses, or ordered “the tap to stop”. If I had I think I should have retired from the contest so far as Mr Burnish was concerned. I did not know Mr Jackson till his name was mentioned. Finding great difficulty in seeing each individual elector, I suggested that I should address them collectively on some Saturday night. I remember perfectly well going to the Rising Sun and Waggon and Horses. It was some time in October, after I had nearly exhausted my canvass. At the Rising Sun I saw one or two voters who, I was told, were there by appointment to see me. I canvassed them in a private room. I cannot remember now who they were, but my impression is that they were some of Mr Hemming's dependants and some of Mr Sturge's. I certainly did not pay for refreshments for any of the persons there. At the Waggon and Horses precisely the same thing occurred. Jackson never, to my knowledge, paid for a glass of rum and water for a voter or for any person. I heard the evidence of Stephen Fort and his wife. Some portions of the evidence were totally false. When he spoke something about money, I certainly did not say, “Mr Radford and Mr Rogers will make it all right”.

Taylor was not at all an agent of mine. I did not know him. I gave no authority in any way for half a sovereign being given to Fort. I never canvassed anybody in Mr Price's tanyard. I canvassed some of the men outside. I made a point of not going into any of the works, because I thought it was not fair to the men. I gave 10s to some old women near Mrs Lucas's. I was told they were poor, and they asked me for a cup of tea. On the morning I arrived, I in the same way relieved some old ladies at Mr Shaw's gates. Soon afterwards I received a letter from Miss Havergal, stating that the money I gave for tea had been spent in a more objectionable way, and from that time I drew my purse strings tight. Never to my knowledge was 5s given to Mrs Griffin of the Fox, nor was 10s given to Gillam, the landlord of the Vine, to my knowledge or by my consent. (A Voice : "No, there never was ; I'm the man, my lord").

Cross-examined by Mr Stephen : I was first introduced to Bewdley by my late partner's son. I did not at the time object to the appointment of the committee at the meeting in the Town Hall on the 7th of July, but I did not intend to abide by it. I never in the course of my canvass had my attention called to the fact that a great deal of drinking was going on. The only place where I saw a large number of people was at Mrs Hinton's, in Wribbenhall. I never addressed the people at a public house except on that occasion. I do not know who employed the watchers, and when I enquired what the "watching" meant I was told that it had been a custom on each side to watch the voters. I have not the slightest idea who put the watchers on. I gave a donation of £10 to the Bewdley Conservative Working Men's Association. I have not yet had a final settlement with my agents. I have paid two sums of £300 each to Mr Crowther and £500 to Mr Pardoe.

Mr Stephen : Mr Pardoe's final account amounts to £750, and you have already paid £1100 ; that makes £341 more than there's any account rendered of to the public? Witness : I hope I shall get it back. (Laughter).

Mr Stephen : When were they paid? Witness : £600, I think, before the election and £500 after. I have no reason to believe that other payments have been made on my account besides those mentioned in the accounts produced. I have not personally received any accounts.

Thomas Radford, carpet manufacturer, Kidderminster, was examined by Mr Gifford. He said he lived at Stourport. He contradicted Fort's evidence in some particulars, and said that when Fort suggested that he had been put to some expense he never told him he should make it all right, nor did Mr Rogers. He admitted that he had offered Ainsworth work, but it had nothing to do with the election.

Witness was briefly cross-examined, after which the Court adjourned until Saturday morning.

SATURDAY Mr Justice Blackburn took his seat at ten o'clock. Mr Fitzjames Stephen QC, the Hon Charles Leigh and Mr Sturge again appeared for the petitioners. Of the respondent's counsel only Mr Poland was present, Mr Giffard QC having been called away to London in the case of Overend, Gurney and Co.

The Court, as before, was crowded, and the proceedings excited more than the usual interest, from the position several of the witnesses held in connection with the election.

Charles Pountney, comb manufacturer, Bewdley, was the first witness. He said : I know Mr Griffin, the landlord of the Fox. It is not true I ever said to him that I would give him £5, and he might draw a hogshead of ale. I did not say to him about any entertainment at his house, "if your's is the last it shall be the best". He did not say he would not make up his mind for five hogsheads. I did not say anything to him about his license, or threaten it should be taken away. I don't recollect his saying there had been nothing done at his house. I am a member of the Town Council. I was at his house on the polling day. I saw Mr Morgan (the petitioner's solicitor) there. When we got into the room, I asked Griffin if he had made up his mind which way to vote. He said, "I don't know – I want money. If you'll give me £10 and an order for a hogshead of beer, I'll vote for Sir Richard". I left then. I did not hear any disturbance. Some people rushed in afterwards. I heard a noise outside. Several persons were round the door when I went in. I went there about three o'clock to know if he had made up his mind ; but to please himself whether he came to the poll or not. I did not watch. I had my work to do.

By Mr Poland : Sir Richard at the time was eighty ahead and more.

Christopher Pountney, builder, and a voter for Sir Richard, examined by Mr Poland : Am brother to the last witness, and was with him at the Fox on the polling day about three o'clock. I and my brother went in, and we saw Mr Lloyd's solicitor in the front room. My brother spoke to Griffin. He answered, "Come upstairs". We went upstairs with Griffin. There was no one else there. Griffin said he thought he should go for Lloyd. He said, "I want £10 and a hogshead of ale". My brother said to me, "Come down – I'll have nothing to do with it". There was nothing said about the license – that the gentlemen who had given him the license could take it away again. He said his house had not been used like the others. My brother did not say, "I'll give you £5 and a hogshead of ale", nor anything to that effect.

By Mr Stephen : I saw Mr Morgan that day, and Mr Lloyd in the street. Mr Morgan was not forced into the crowd. Some people came in, but there was no rush. There was no disturbance.

His Lordship said there was no case of intimidation here.

Mr Thomas Potter Charles, postmaster at Stourport, and carrying on the business of an ironmonger, examined by Mr Poland : William Jones is a rural messenger. On the Sunday morning before the election, he was an hour late. I had sent for him. He looked to me to be suffering from the effects of drink overnight – he was muddled. I said, "I suppose you have been to the Swan and got drunk". He said, "It's no use telling a lie, for I was there". I said, "I suppose they extorted a promise from you". He replied, "They did". I voted for Sir Richard. The Swan is used by the Liberal party. I said, "Oh, very well", and that was the end of it. I did not threaten him in any way, nor say, "If you vote for Lloyd it will be the worse for you". I said nothing about plenty waiting for his job. I did not say I would report him. I had not seen Mr Rogers that day. I did not give a breakfast to the persons employed at the Post Office on the polling day.

By Hon C Leigh : Rogers had been to my shop many times on business. I and Rogers had never seen Jones together, but Rogers had seen him before that. I have only one letter carrier – the others (four) are rural messengers. I had only one messenger (Jones) who did vote.

Re-examined by Mr Poland : I have been postmaster for ten or eleven years.

Mr Joseph Rogers, tanner and leather merchant, Stourport, who voted for Sir R Glass, examined by Mr Poland : I know Fort (the first witness examined). I was not present when Sir Richard saw Fort. Sir Richard told me not to allow anyone to canvass for him but his agents. I had no authority to bribe for Sir Richard. I did not see Radford and Sir Richard with Fort. Sir Richard was then canvassing with him. I have been in court most of the time of this enquiry. I heard Jones (the rural postman) examined. I met him at Mr Charles's (postmaster) as I often do. As I was coming out of the shop, Jones came in with his bags. I said to him, "I want to see you to ask when Sir Richard can see you about your vote". His wife met him in the street, and said someone had been down to her house to see him. I laughed and said, "Shall I speak to you here, or go down with you?" They live close by. She said, "You may as well come down". I went to Jones's house. Jones's wife said, "We are very poor". I replied, "I know you are, but whose fault is it? Is it not your own conduct that has got you into trouble several times?" She said, "Yes, but we mean to do better in future". I said, "I hope you will". She then said, "We have been offered money by the other party". Jones said, "Shut your mouth you ---- fool ; you will get yourself in trouble". Jones said, "I want a new arm very badly", (he has only one arm). "Won't you give me one?" I said, "I shall be very happy to do so, but not at election time. If I gave you one, they would say I had given it you for your vote". He said, "Oh, the Baldwyns have been very good to me". I said, "I know they have. They got you a place before you went to the Post Office, and you lost it through your bad conduct". He said, "They are very good friends to me yet". I replied, "You have been reported several times by the Post Office, and you had better be steady. Your wife has had a summons for you once or twice, and once I believe for trying to cut her throat. If you get drinking at this election you'll very likely get into trouble again". He said, "Can you do anything for me? It's all very fine talking". I said, "I cannot ; will you promise me not to vote until you have seen Sir R Glass?" He said, "I don't know about that". I got up to leave, and said, "Don't go to that man at the Swan – you'll very likely get into trouble if you do". I then left. He did not say that if he did not vote for Sir R Glass he would lose his place at the Post Office. I did not say that if he offended Charles he would lose his situation.

The Messrs Baldwin referred to are ironmasters, the supporters of Mr Lloyd. One of them is one of the petitioners. I never treated anyone at any public house before the election. The demonstration was on my grounds. I know Ainsworth. I saw him at the latter end of October. Mr Radford was at the door with Mr Gardner. George Anderson was near them. Sir Richard was not there. I went in and asked him when he could see Sir Richard about his vote. He said, "I have not made up my mind". I said, "I wish you would, and let me bring him to see you". He said he would not make up his mind at present. Mr Radford said, "Where do you work now, Ben?" He replied, "I have no work, I wish I had". Mr Radford said, "I want someone to work at my gasworks. Can you tell me anyone who can do it? If you like, you can go tomorrow morning". I did not hear him say anything to Ainsworth about his vote. I employ 50 or 60 men – sometimes more. Three of them, I believe, voted for Lloyd. Sir Richard, to the best of my belief, never canvassed any of my men while they were at work, and Mr Lloyd never asked me.

By Mr Stephen : Many persons told me they would have voted for Sir Richard if they had dared. Some said their children would lose their work if they voted for Sir Richard. About fifteen or eighteen of my men voted for Sir Richard. I don't know who paid for refreshments at the demonstration.

William Fowler, carpenter and joiner of Oatlands Row, Bewdley, a voter for Sir R Glass, examined by Mr Poland : Knew Mr Hamer. He came to witness's house for some work, and said he wanted some money to begin the shoe trade. Witness asked him if £5 would be any use to him. He said £5 or £6 would be of use to him in his trade. Witness did not lend Hamer the money, and would not have lent it to him if he had had it. He did not ask him to vote for anyone. Witness is parish clerk of St Ann's.

Mr Benjamin Gardiner, solicitor, Bewdley, said : I was one of Sir Richard Glass's agents at the last election. Mr Pardoe was also one of his agents. I had no particular instructions. At a meeting of his friends, Sir Richard said he would do nothing but what was straightforward and right, and that he would have nothing to do with treating and bribery. He said he would see every voter himself. I have received £50 on account for my services. I did not know of beer being served at public houses without being paid for. I have heard a good deal of the evidence on that point. I did not know till I heard the evidence that there had been one half the meetings at the houses which have been mentioned. I had nothing to do with the watchers. I have never been engaged in other elections. So far as I am concerned, I am not aware of any corrupt practice at the election for the purpose of procuring votes for Sir Richard. I saw a man named Ainsworth. Mr Radford and Mr Rogers were present. I urged him to make up his mind and to vote for Sir Richard, but he would not promise. Mr Radford said he wanted some gas fittings put up at Kidderminster, and if he liked he might go and do it. Ainsworth did not say he would go.

Mr William Alfred Crowther, solicitor, Kidderminster, examined by Mr Poland, said : I have a branch office at Stourport. I was one of Sir Richard's agents at the election. I have had two sums of £300 each from Sir Richard. One sum was on the 28th August, and the other on the 9th November. I attended to the registration in my district. I expended not a penny in bribing or corrupting any of the electors. The money was for professional purposes only. None of the money was applied illegally. Of the first £300, £100 I gave to Pardoe, and the other £200 to the general purpose of the registration. Of the second £300, when I had it I believed I should have to pay the Stourport bills. I had it for my professional services. I still have the £300 in my possession. The electoral area of Stourport is a large district. I had not the slightest knowledge that houses at Bewdley were being kept open and beer given away.

By Mr Stephen : I put on no watchers at Stourport. I was chiefly engaged at Kidderminster. I was not at the hustings on the day of election. I had not studied the Act before the election. It appears to have been irregular that I should have had any money. I have not made out a bill for my own services. I have to pay the check and slip clerks. I have received a bill for £28 for advertising in a Kidderminster newspaper. I have also received a bill from the inspectors, and one from Mr Humphery of Halesowen. I think it is 20 guineas. I have received none from any of the inns. The clerk's bill would be about £5. I have paid the registration expenses ; these were for getting

information. Several working men volunteered to get information. My clerk paid, I think, 10 of them. They were paid £3 each, with one exception.

William Jackson, plumber and glazier, a non voter, examined by Mr Poland : I live at Wribbenhall. I got what information I could, and made a report to the Conservative party. Mr Herbert Pardoe employed me to watch the voters. I had £173 12s at different times. I was to see the persons paid who are mentioned in the list produced. They were to be paid at Osman Pountney's, at the Malt Shovel. There were two appointed to assist me. I don't know who they were. I first saw them in a bedroom at Mr Pountney's. They wore a disguise – one had a wig, and one a false beard ; I should imagine it false. The watchers were called one by one upstairs, where they were paid one at a time. I put the money on the table, and the two strangers took it up. I kept the list and called over the names. I made the second and third payments at my shop. Mr Pardoe said the watchers would probably be dissatisfied with what they were paid, and might waylay the strangers. I saw Sir Richard one night. I was out, and did not expect to be paid anything.

By Mr Stephen : Mr H Pardoe gave me the first list on the Friday after the election. Some of the money was not paid away. About £5 is left. I have never been asked for the balance. The total paid by me was £117 9s.

Osman Pountney, a voter for Sir R Glass, examined by Mr Poland, said : I remember William Jackson and two other men, strangers, paying the watchers. The strangers had wigs on, and one a bit of a beard. Jackson said those two came to pay the men with him. Jackson called the names and I admitted them. I was inside. I am sure no voter was amongst those who were paid. I saw Mr Pardoe there. I did not see him give any money. Sir Richard was upstairs at the time. Griffin told me he should vote for the man who gave him the most money.

By Mr Stephen : I have never been a watcher, and don't want to be. (Laughter).

Mr John Bury, examined by Mr Poland : I am a solicitor in practice at Bewdley, and voted for Sir R Glass. I saw John Darks on the occasion of having canvassed a person named Humpherson for his vote. I gave 1s to a man named Dark, who had not a vote, and who asked me for something.

George Baker Burnish, examined by Mr Poland : I reside at Kidderminster, and am clerk to Mr A Pardoe. My salary is £80 a year. In July I stayed at the Wheatsheaf in this town. I was employed by Mr Pardoe in election and his own office matters. [Having spoken as to the establishment of the Conservative Working Men's Association, of which he was secretary, witness continued.] I usually occupied the chair, and persons had drink without paying for it. I used to stop the tap. About 20 meetings were held altogether. No one paid for the drink, which was, however, paid for at the Peacock and, by my orders, at the Waggon and Horses. £3 was paid at one place and £4 at the other, out of the funds of the association ; and the other beer that has been had will be paid for from the same funds. I was not acting in any way as clerk to Mr Pardoe then. I believe I made use of the words “six months on the round stair”. Nearly everyone was chatting about having six months, and I used the same expression. There were 115 members. Honorary members paid 10s 6d a year, besides donations. I am not aware that any payments were made by Mr Pardoe for bribery or treating.

Mr R Acton Pardoe, examined by Mr Poland : At the last election I was one of Sir R Glass's agents. When Sir Richard came I believe there was some sort of entertainment on my lawn, but I did not order it. I believe Mrs Pardoe gave it ; the cost was only a trifle. I had £500 from Sir Richard, not including £100 from Mr Crowther towards the registration. I was not aware of these open houses where drink was supplied for nothing, nor that my clerk was in the habit of ordering drink at various public houses, and allowing people to drink it without payment. I have not applied any of the money towards bribery or corruption. I only employed one watcher ; that was my own man. There were watchers on the other side. Some persons came to me and said unless the electors were looked after, some of them would be lost. As there was some excitement, I thought it better to have two strange men to protect me. The two strangers (who came from Worcester at my request) went to the Malt Shovel. I gave the money to Jackson. Altogether £173 12s was paid to these watchers. I have looked through the lists, and I am not aware there is a single voter on the list. I am not aware of any voter who was paid for watching. People went watching of their own accord. I know Mrs Sophia

Griffin. I went to her house on July 8th. I saw her. I did not direct her attention to the fireplace, nor did I put 5s in her hand. Nothing of the kind took place. There was an old man in the house named Rogers, and I gave Mrs Griffin 1s 6d, and told her to give him some beer. I knew the old man, and had known him all my life. Neither on that occasion, or on any, did I give any money to procure votes. Sir Richard Glass was upstairs. I did not tell Mrs Griffin to supply a quart or two, and put the rest in her pocket. Mr Webster was upstairs.

Witness was cross-examined at great length by Mr Fitzjames Stephen, chiefly in connection with the employment of watchers. He said there were at least 200 watchers on the other side at Stourport.

Mr Poland did not propose to call any other witnesses that evening, and the Judge then decided that on Monday morning all books and papers of Mr Pardoe's relating to the election might be brought to court.

MONDAY Mr Justice Blackburn took his seat at ten o'clock. The same learned counsel appeared. Mr Giffard said he believed no one examined Sir Richard Glass about the 10s given to the man with the broken arm.

His Lordship said he had thought that matter was explained, and did not require further investigation.

Mr Giffard observed that Sir R Glass was anxious on this matter. There was a sum of £5, which was not mentioned, and he believed was not known to anyone. It was given by Sir Richard to various persons who were injured in one of the attacks upon himself and his party in July. He had told his learned friend of it, and Sir Richard was anxious not to keep back anything. He believed nothing turned upon it.

His Lordship said though giving charity during an election was not wise, it was not corrupt.

Mr Stephen said there was an election row, in which people on Sir Richard Glass's side got their noses more or less damaged.

His Lordship said such a thing was only too certain where so much beer was drunk, but Mr Giffard had done quite right in saying what he had.

The following witnesses were then called :-

Mr Herbert Pardoe, examined by Mr Stephen, said : I went to Kidderminster to meet some men who came from London on the Sunday before the polling day. They were roughs, 29 in number. They were brought in case their services were required, but they were not required. I don't know whether these men were paid. Ten were at the Acorn, eight at the Swan and eleven at the Peacock. My father told me to meet them. They left Bewdley on the night of the nomination, going by a bye way to Stourport. Detective Warren took charge of them.

His Lordship said it was a very pretty road, but he should not call it a bye road.

Examination continued : There were women screaming on the nomination day, but I don't know that they charged for it. I believe the women sent in a bill to my father ; I don't know whether it was for screaming. I was at the Swan Inn, Stourport, and had a conversation with Mr Watson a short time ago. Mr Baldwyn was there. Mr Watson asked what the election expenses would be. I answered they might be £2000 or £3000 for all I knew. I afterwards said they were reckoned at between £800 and £900. I have not looked through the accounts that have been filed. I was commissioned to enquire about the watchers when they came to my father's office. I took a list of all who claimed to be paid. The rough draft was destroyed or lost. I have kept a fair copy of all who came, and put the amount against each name that I thought was a fair charge. There were names of voters, which were excluded by myself and Mr Burnish from the list afterwards made of those whom Jackson had to pay.

Cross-examined by Mr Giffard : Mr Watson is the attorney for the petitioners. It was a casual conversation.

Re-examined : I put boys &c at the head of the list, because many of them were lads of 16. I allowed 4s a day, and the same for a night to a grown up person. The boys had 3s, and other sums according to size.

By the Judge : They were employed to see that voters were not taken away. They looked into flies

to see if voters were there. I believe one morning at two o'clock a voter was being taken away.

The Judge : And £200 was paid for men and boys to prevent one voter being carried off?

Mr H G Goldingham, examined by Mr Giffard, said : I am a solicitor of Worcester. I was employed by Mr Pardoe to send over persons from Worcester to make payments. I handed the letter to a person in my employ. His name is Joseph Russon ; I don't know where he is. I gave him the letter, told him he was to take the train to Bewdley, and I would write to Mr Pardoe. Mr Pardoe wrote that there were some refractory people here, and he wanted a trusty person to make the payments. I gave no specific instructions to Russon ; I merely handed him the letter, and he said he would go over. I believe he took another man with him. I told him I had heard of rows here, and he had better be prepared to get away in case of another row. There was a row here, and the men were nearly lynched. I told him he had better adopt means to prevent himself being known, and I believe he showed me in a carpet bag what he was going to take with him. It was a simple wig.

Cross-examined by Mr Stephen : Russon was employed by me in the city of Worcester and county elections, and was in the habit of paying all sorts of people.

Mr Acton Pardoe produced various documents relating to the election, and was re-examined.

Mr Stephen : Your son has told us 29 men came down from London, and went back on the night of the nomination day. Who paid their expenses?

Witness : I did ; £90 odd.

Mr Stephen : Is that in your return of election expenses?

Witness : No. I took no receipt from them. I did not actually pay them, but I found the money. I do not know who paid them.

Mr Stephen : Who did you give the money to?

Witness : One of the men that came here ; I don't know him.

Mr Stephen : You gave £90 to a man you did not know, and took no receipt? Why did you not put it in the election accounts?

Witness : I should think such payments would not be put there. I applied to the Home Office for additional assistance to the police, and it was upon the receipt of the answer that the London men were employed. They were employed for the purpose of protecting Sir Richard Glass's voters in consequence of the threats from the other side. The people on the other side not only threatened but came here in great force determined to do mischief. I heard they came from Wednesbury.

Mr Stephen : Mr Gardner told us he received £50 on account, and you also received £50. You have not made out here your own bill to Sir R Glass.

Witness : No. The bill from the Wheatsheaf, £123 2s 6d, I have only just had.

Mr Giffard : £81 12s is for use of rooms.

His Lordship : This does not appear in the election expenses.

Witness : I have received it since I was here on Saturday. The Mr Taylor, whose bill for refreshments is £35 19s, is the landlord of the Black Boy, Wribbenhall. I don't know that it was one of the houses where the men from London were kept.

Mr Stephen : What happened there?

Witness : Sir R Glass had luncheon there occasionally.

Mr Stephen : But Sir Richard Glass could not have drunk 9s worth of rum, gin, whisky on November 9th. (Laughter). I will give you some of the items. Here is one : lodgings, refreshments, use of commercial room from July 11th to November 20th.

Witness : I don't know about it – I only received the bill on Saturday evening.

Mr Stephen : After you had given your evidence?

Witness : Yes.

Mr Giffard said that was his case. He proceeded to remark that no doubt there were matters which, taking by one construction of the conduct that had been pursued by Mr Pardoe, would greatly imperil Sir Richard Glass's position. But it would not do for his learned friend to rely upon any stupidity – he could use no other expression – of an agent ; the conduct of that agent must have been tainted by corruption. If Mr Pardoe had yielded to solicitation and done that which he ought to have resisted, if he did it from weakness or want of knowledge and not with a corrupt motive, that would

not imperil Sir R Glass's seat. It appeared to him what had been called treating had been greatly exaggerated. It was something like a stage, where the same persons were frequently brought on the scene and made to represent a large number of persons. The question he had first to deal with was whether treating was done with the authority and direction of Sir R Glass and, if so, whether it was done corruptly.

His Lordship said he thought he might relieve Mr Giffard of one part of his task. He did not think upon this enquiry that there was any reason to suppose Sir R Glass was personally cognisant of the treating, and Mr Giffard might confine his remarks to the question of agency.

Mr Giffard said it was impossible to disguise from oneself that it was a matter fraught with the gravest suspicion that the person engaged in transactions of this kind should be the clerk of Sir R Glass's election agent. But if anybody intended to corrupt the election without imperilling the member's seat, one would have supposed that the very last person who would have been selected was the well known clerk to the election agent.

His Lordship pointed out that treating would not produce the desired effect unless it was known on which side it was done.

Mr Giffard said that in a place like Bewdley it would very soon be known which were Sir R Glass's houses without its being placarded by Burnish taking the chair. He submitted that there was no proof of Sir R Glass's responsibility for the conduct of Burnish. The principle of responsibility must be confined to such matters as reasonably and presumably fell within the scope of Mr Pardoe's clerk's authority ; if they went further than that there must be specific instructions given to make the principle applicable. Mr Pardoe was not the man to keep back anything in cross-examination, and if he had any reasonable ground to suppose that Burnish was going about to the public houses and acting as it was proved that he did he would have said so, but he declared that he never heard of it. He certainly gave no authority for the supply of drink, and not one farthing which was spent in that way ever came from Mr Pardoe. There was the question whether if this treating was carried on it was done corruptly. The degree of indiscretion involved in such a transaction it was impossible to overstate, but wherever a committee of persons were conducting an election, and as in this case there were meetings of men holding common sentiments at public houses, if any member of the committee were there he supposed it would be considered rather harsh and very impolite to refuse to allow strangers to participate in the hospitality going on. But he did not think they might raise the presumption that it was done corruptly. There appeared to be no selection of voters, for a great number of the persons were non voters, and some of them were in Mr Sturge's employment. He had never distinctly discovered why the institution of watching should continue. In discussing the propriety of the institution it would not make much difference whether the sum expended was £200 odd or, as appeared to have been expended on the other side, £64. Sir R Glass seemed to have had those about him who invested with mystery a most innocent thing. There being but one policeman in the town, it was natural for a candidate to wish for additional assistance, but why the matter should have been treated with such mystery he did not know. The hypothesis was that a man was brought to avert inquiry, but he could not imagine anything more stupid than the way in which it was done.

His Lordship alluded to the fable of the ostrich, which hides its head in order that its body might not be seen. Although it was very foolish, it was extremely good evidence to show that the ostrich intended to hide its head.

Mr Giffard said the case would be different if there was anything to conceal in the transaction, which he submitted there was not. It was not proved that a single voter was paid. A more serious question was that of the claims by others than those actually paid. He could not help thinking the number of non voters actually paid reflected some light on the object of the employment. It was not to be taken that because a person employed a voter, it was necessarily such an employment as would amount to bribery. Mr Pardoe had undoubtedly been guilty of great rashness, but not of any corrupt intentions. He ventured to think, with regard to what might be called individual cases of bribery, they had been answered ; and, so far as he could see, there was no substantial case made out on the part of the petitioners. If he did not deal with individual cases of bribery it was not because

he was afraid of doing so ; he had dealt with the substance, and he did not think his Lordship's mind would be affected by the fringe. As regarded direct bribery by any person in the relation of agent, the substantial and serious matters had been abandoned or contradicted in the course of the case. In Ainsworth's case, the person who made the offer did not connect it in any way with voting, and that which gave a colour and affixed a character to the particular solicitations had been denied by the persons who were present. With regard to Danks's men being brought from Bristol, the only evidence he need discuss was that which affected Mr Rogers. All that was proved was that Mr Rogers paid Rowley's wages for the time he was absent, but it was also a fact that Mr Rogers paid all his men their full wages when they went to poll, whichever way they voted. In conclusion, the learned counsel said Sir Richard Glass may have been imprudent in some things he did. Although it was very difficult to resist solicitation in the sight of suffering, it would have been very much better if Sir Richard had not spent a single farthing out of his pocket. However he hardly believed his learned friend would dispute that Sir Richard came there with a sincere desire to do nothing corrupt or illegal. He humbly submitted that nothing of the kind could be traced to him, and he was convinced that whatever might be his Lordship's judgement, it would not in any way affect Sir Richard's honour as a gentleman.

Mr Stephen then replied. Following the arrangements of his learned friend, he would first observe upon the treating. It would be found that he had proved treating, which was confessed to be treating, at no less than twenty public houses in the town.

His Lordship said that it was nearly the number he himself had made out, but it was true that some of the public houses being mentioned half a dozen times, a person listening to the evidence would naturally have a very exaggerated impression of the amount of treating that had taken place.

Mr Stephen said that, considering the case of Bewdley, it was a fair inference that there were few houses where treating was not going on, and out of thirty two publicans more or less mixed up in the matter, twenty eight of them voted for Sir R Glass. He thought there could be no doubt that Mr Reynolds must be regarded as Sir R Glass's agent, and he submitted that a more transparent blind was never set up than the Conservative Working Men's Association. He said plainly that Mr Pardoe who, by his own confession, had been engaged in a variety of practices which he thought ought not to go into election expenses, and who had been concerned in what he knew to be wrong, was a party to getting up the association, in order that things might be done through its means which he could not do himself. It was said that Burnish was to be paid. He submitted that that was a blind, and the proof of it was that he never was paid. Supposing Burnish's account of the matter to be true, the committee passed a resolution that drink should be given away and paid for out of the funds of the association. If that was an honest transaction, was it conceivable that Burnish should not have told his master. They could not put any other construction on the matter than that Mr Pardoe allowed his clerk to be secretary of the association for the purpose of doing some of those things that, to use his own expression, "don't go into election expenses". After remarking on the amount of funds at the disposal of the association, Mr Stephen said that according to the rules Burnish had been guilty of the grossest misapplication of the funds, which he was not sure would not amount under the new Act to felony. It was impossible to resist the inference that sooner or later supposing there was no inquiry the money would have been paid out of election funds. There could be no doubt that Mr Pardoe put Burnish into the position to do the dirty work, and that Burnish did it. Mr Stephen then referred to the disclosures respecting the system of watching, and said that, according to the information he had got, 40 or 50 voters were employed. A considerable number of non voters were relatives of voters, and their employment would be a means of influencing votes. Sir Richard Glass acted illegally in handing £600 to Mr Crowther, and this threw suspicion on the whole conduct of the election. Allowing for everything, Mr Crowther must at the present time have £300 illegally in his hands, and if he was so minded he could pay it away discharging bills of which the public and Sir R Glass knew nothing. There could not be a more suspicious circumstance than a candidate having paid £340 more to his agents than his expenses were returned at. There seemed to have been a continual dribble of money from Sir Richard. The learned counsel remarked on the manner in which the election accounts were made up, and then dealt with the specific cases of bribery. He

said the case of Ainsworth, who was offered three weeks' work, was as clear a case of bribery as was ever proved. He commented on the bringing of Mr Danks's men from Bristol, and then said a good deal had been stated with regard to watchers on both sides, but there was no proof that Mr Lloyd's side employed any watchers who were not returned in the accounts. He did not wish it to go forth that there was any substantial allegation of any improper practices on their side, but he did wish it to be known that the statements of Mr Giffard rested on the barest hearsay of interested partisans.

After some conversation about the scrutiny,

His Lordship said he had no doubt he must declare the election void, and if Mr Stephen wanted time to consider whether he would go on with the scrutiny, he would state his reasons at once.

After consulting with his clients, Mr Stephen said he was authorised by Mr Lloyd to state that the majority was very large, and the difficulty of proving particular cases very great. Mr Lloyd's great object in claiming the seat was to afford scope for the fullest inquiry and recrimination, and under the circumstances, feeling the great difficulty of establishing a case which would take off 100 votes, he wished to withdraw his claim to the seat.

His Lordship said there were one or two smaller matters which he must reserve till a later period, but as to the general question he might state at once the ground on which he proceeded. He did not think anything had been brought forward which would justify him in saying that Sir Richard Glass was personally cognisant of, or as an individual was a party to, any illegal practices. He thought Sir Richard Glass intended that nothing should be done to imperil the seat he wished to obtain. There was some evidence which would go against Sir R Glass on this point, but it was not by any means enough. However, Sir Richard, like every other candidate who employed agents, was answerable, not for the penalties which would attach to acts done without his authority, but for the purpose of losing his seat, if any person employed as his agent in the election was guilty of corrupt practices. As to the point of what constituted agency for which a candidate was answerable, it was a matter which it was important should be generally known. One could not lay down a precise rule about it, but in every instance in which it was shown that to the knowledge of the candidate himself or to the knowledge of his agent that a person acted at all furthering the election for him, in trying to get votes, that was evidence tending to show that the person so acting was so authorised to act as an agent. He did not think it was at all essential to show that an agent for that purpose was paid. The question was one of degree, and then came the question, "What is sufficient evidence to prove agency?" Upon that he should apprehend that where evidence was given, as in this case, that when the candidate was going about, a gentleman previously went and requested the voters to meet Sir Richard Glass at such a place, and on coming to the place, said, "Here is Sir Richard come to ask for your vote", or introduced him in other words, all that was admissible to show that the gentleman was an agent. The question for the Court sitting to try the matter and determine upon it, was to ascertain whether those things that which each in itself was little, were in the aggregate sufficient to show that the person was employed or authorised to act to such an extent as would make him an agent for whom the candidate would be responsible. Where everybody would agree that there was some evidence of agency, there might be a great difference of opinion as to whether that evidence was sufficient, and in each case the judge would weigh the facts as would a jury or an election committee. He must bring common sense to bear upon the matter, and satisfy himself whether the evidence was sufficient or not. Such a question should not turn upon minute particulars as to what particular words were used or particular things done, but upon the common sense broad view of it. In the present case he felt no difficulty whatever about it, because it was clearly proved, and was not indeed a disputed fact, that Sir Richard Glass deposited a considerable sum - £1100 he thought altogether - in the hands of Mr Crowther and Mr Pardoe, directing them, in his letters, and his Lordship saw no reason to doubt that he directed them *bona fide* - to apply that money only to honest, proper expenses. But giving that money without exercising personally, or by any other person, any control over the manner in which it was spent, and not, in fact, knowing how it was spent, one could come to no other conclusion than that he made those persons - principally Mr Pardoe, but Mr Crowther also - his agents for the election to almost the fullest extent which agency

could be given. Any persons who were constituted agents to that extent made those whom they employed for any purposes of the election agents to the extent of their employment. He took it that an agent employed in the manner stated here made a candidate responsible not only for his own acts but for the acts of those whom he employed, although the candidate might not know them or be brought into personal contact with them. The analogy he had used to Mr Giffard was strong, and would so well convey his meaning to a lawyer that he would repeat it. A sheriff was responsible for the under sheriff and the under sheriff's agent ; he was responsible not only for the acts done by virtue of the magnate, but for those done under colour of the magnate. Then came the question, was it shown there were any corrupt practices on the part of the agents thus employed, or those employed for them? The first great question which arose was as to the treating. His Lordship read sec 4 of 17th and 18th Vic, c102, and said those who prepared the Act endeavoured to take in almost anything that could possibly happen, but wisely added the word "corruptly". Upon that word there was no doubt at all in his own mind. The true construction of the Act was stated by Mr Justice Willes in the case of Cooper v Slade, that corruptly did not mean wickedly, immorally or dishonestly, but it meant with the object and intention of doing that which the Legislature plainly forbade. Giving of meat and drink was treating when the person who gave it had the intention of treating. The amount of evidence was what was required to be considered. Individual things might be very slight, a mere featherweight, but a large number of small things would make up a strong case ; consequently it was very important to inquire whether these small matters existed. His Lordship mentioned the case of a man who was given a shilling to drink Sir R Glass's health, and said if such a matter stood alone he should not consider it proved corrupt treating. In such a case as this they must take the common sense view of the matter. Going to the strict letter of the law frequently produced mischief, and if an election was to be declared void through a trifle of that sort such would be the effect produced. They must inquire into each case and see whether all the cases together justified the conclusion that there was corrupt treating. If the evidence showed that a large number of public houses – there were 18 or 19 of them – were continually open during the election so that whoever wanted to get drink got it, it would be a perfect mockery for anyone to attempt to deny that that was done for the purposes which the Legislature forbade, and was corrupt treating. Then came the question, by whom was that done? Was it done by the agents for whom Sir R Glass was responsible? That brought them to Burnish, who was very considerably engaged as Mr Pardoe's clerk during the election. He ordered all the drink, and stopped it, and in fact corruptly treated. There could be no question about it. Another question arose, was Mr Pardoe cognisant of it? But as far as voiding the election went he had no hesitation in drawing a conclusion. No doubt every person Mr Pardoe employed for the purposes of the election was an agent of Sir R Glass. Then came the question, was the evidence such as to leave no reasonable doubt that Burnish was a person so employed? His Lordship pointed out the nature of the evidence, and said that if Burnish had ordered the drink without authority, and had even paid for it out of his own pocket, it was sufficient to void the election. As a matter of fact, it was impossible for anyone to doubt that Burnish did not pay out of his own pocket, that he did not mean to pay out of the funds of the Conservative Working Men's Association, and that he did mean when he ordered these huge quantities of drink, and it was understood by those who were furnished with the drink, he was pledging the election funds, that he was pledging Mr Pardoe and the others. Mr Pardoe appeared to have entrusted everything to his clerk. Burnish was one of those who made out the list of watchers to be paid ; he was at all the public houses ; and it was incredible that Mr Pardoe should have allowed a salaried clerk to pass his time in such places unless he attended there on his business. Therefore his Lordship had no doubt that Burnish was acting as an election agent to Sir R Glass, being employed by Mr Pardoe for that purpose, and authorised by him. Corrupt treating was clearly proved to have been done by Burnish, and that was important, because when he certified to the Speaker that Mr Pardoe as well as Mr Burnish had been guilty of corrupt treating, it would render it impracticable for him to be employed in election matters for seven years to come. His Lordship commented on the mode in which the election expenses had been returned, and said that how far this might subject Sir R Glass, Mr Pardoe or Mr Crowther to penalties was for others to consider. If

the practical result was that the keepers of the different public houses who supplied the beer lost their money, he should not regret it. Sir R Glass, in paying money to Mr Crowther, acted illegally, and if it had been shown that there had been extensive bribery, it would be a very serious question whether the candidate in bestowing the money was not cognisant of the uses to which it was to be applied. But no case of that kind arose here. Treating was proved, but he did not think it was shown that Sir R Glass anticipated that. There was no proof that the money given to Mr Crowther was expended in any considerable amount of bribery if in any at all. Reverting to the account of the election expenses, his Lordship pointed out that Mr Pardoe had omitted very considerable liabilities, and said that all the evidence led to the conclusion that Mr Pardoe knew perfectly well the money was expended for purposes which would not bear the light of day. He must find that there was corrupt treating by Sir R Glass's agents. Some people on Mr Lloyd's side got drink, but the evidence did not show extensive treating on his side. He must certify that treating did prevail extensively in the borough, and return Mr Pardoe and Burnish as guilty of it. As to the employment of watchers, it was a mischievous practice. His Lordship pointed out the influence it had upon an election, and said if voters were retained with the notion that they would be paid, no matter whether they were paid or not, their votes would be void. The evidence had been brought home in particular cases, and he could only mention that this corrupt practice – for he thought it was a corrupt practice – had prevailed, and he should think after the warning that at the next contested election people would be very cautious as to what they did. There was no ground for believing that there was what might be called general direct bribing. There were isolated cases, but he did not think there was proof of any persons having been bribed by an agent of Sir R Glass. When he gave his certificate he should name those who were proved to his satisfaction to have been guilty of bribery. In conclusion, his Lordship decided that the costs should be borne by the respondent, with the exception of any relating to the scrutiny.

Mr Stephen remarked, with regard to the treating, that Bewdley and Stourport were two distinct places, and the extensive treating was proved to have taken place at Bewdley.

His Lordship said he must confine himself to the borough as a whole ; he could not enter into the question of different districts.

The proceedings then terminated.

119 February 6 1869

WATERMEN'S CHURCH, SEVERN SIDE On Monday evening, being the completion of the first year of the ministry at this church of the Rev Henry Taylor, a number of the congregation and teachers at the Severn Side Ragged School invited the rev gentleman to a tea at the Industrial Home, after which, as a slight appreciation of his labours of love among them, they presented him with a black gown. A very interesting evening was passed, the tea party not breaking up until ten o'clock.

120 February 13 1869

STOURPORT

INQUEST On Tuesday an inquest was held at the Angel Inn by Mr W S P Hughes, on the body of **John Daniels**, a waterman aged 80 years, who was drowned in the river Severn on the 6th February. Deceased had been to Worcester and was returning home, having walked all the distance, and in crossing the fields and coming out into the towing-path on the river side, he fell into the river. The jury returned a verdict of "Death by drowning", and thought the attention of the Local Government Board ought to be called to the present inefficient lights near the river. Some of the most dangerous parts of the town near the locks and river are without lights.

121 March 20 1869

KIDDERMINSTER

A TOUCH OF SYMPATHY WANTED On Monday, Mr R Docker, district coroner, held an inquest at the Albion Inn on the body of Thomas Chatterton, a boy, who was drowned in the Canal on Saturday afternoon. The lad was the son of a weaver living in York Place, and was last seen

alive by a puddler named Thomas Bury, a little before two o'clock on Saturday afternoon. He was then on some steps at the Canal side, and must soon afterwards have fallen into the water. A boatman named **Joseph Bishop** passed the spot a little after two, and saw a boy's cap floating on the water and bubbles rising to the surface near it. Instead of attempting a rescue, he coolly told another man there was a boy in the water, and went on with his boat. The boy was not got out of the water for a quarter of an hour or so, and was then past recovery. The jury strongly commented upon Bishop's conduct, and it was stated by some persons in the room that he had said he actually saw the boy in the water, frothing at the mouth. Mr Cowen, surgeon, said there was froth on the boy's mouth when he was taken out of the water. Bishop excused himself from rendering assistance by saying he could not swim, but it appeared that the water was only four or five feet deep, and quite level at the spot. A verdict of "Accidental death" was returned, and the Coroner gave Bishop a little advice as to showing more pluck if another emergency of the same kind arose.

122 April 10 1869

ACCIDENT On Saturday, **Henry Harman**, a boatman, was going on board his boat at the Quay by means of a ladder, when the boat drifted and Harman fell into the water. His shouts attracted the attention of two young men, who went to his assistance and, one of them having got to the boat, succeeded in pulling him out of the water.

123 April 10 1869

DROITWICH BOROUGH MAGISTRATES' OFFICE, YESTERDAY

ASSAULT **Sarah**, the wife of **Matthew Pittaway**, bargeman, was summoned on the information of **Elizabeth**, the wife of **George Harrison**, for assaulting her on the 31st ult at Marlborough. Fined 1s and 9s 6d costs.

124 May 8 1869

ALVECHURCH **George Mason**, a boatman, committed suicide on Sunday. He had been drinking for a fortnight previous. Mr Docker held an inquest on the body, and the verdict was that deceased committed suicide whilst temporarily insane.

125 May 22 1869

UPTON-ON-SEVERN PETTY SESSIONS YESTERDAY (THURSDAY)

DRUNKENNESS **William Oakley**, boatman, was summoned for being drunk and refusing to quit the Star public house at Upton on the 18th inst. Fined 10s and costs.

126 June 5 1869

PERSHORE POLICE INTELLIGENCE, TUESDAY JUNE 1

STEALING A TURKEY **Charles Simmons**, boatman of Bidford, and George Aldington of the Fish and Anchor, Littleton, were charged with stealing a cock turkey, the property of Mr Joseph Baker Workman of Riden in the hamlet of Charlton. Aldington was seen near Mr Workman's carrying something in his hand ; feathers were found in the vicinity ; and the prisoner Simmons told the policeman who apprehended him that he said to Aldington, "Let's have the turkey", to which Aldington replied, "Just as you like" ; Simmons then knocked down the turkey, and Aldington put in in Simmons's (?frail?). When Aldington was taken, he told the policeman " he supposed they would get three months, which would kill him without beer". Mr Hodson (from the office of Messrs New, Prance and Garrard, Evesham) appeared for Aldington, and said there was no evidence against him but that of Simmons ; and it had been laid down that the statement of an accomplice was not evidence. Aldington was acquitted, and became bail for Simmons, who was committed for trial.

127 June 5 1869

It is probable that many of our readers are unacquainted with the Ragged School and Home ; and

yet it occupies no mean place among the charities of the city. We wish it were more generally known, for its object is so truly useful and benevolent that it deserves much more support than it receives. The Ragged School is situated on the Upper Quay, close adjoining the Watermen's Church, and is held in the identical barge originally employed by the Rev John Davis as a floating chapel upon the river. It has an attendance of about 70 children, with a Sunday School of double that number. The "Home" is close to the school, and faces the river. The object of its promoters is to rescue little girls from those influences which seem likely to bring them into criminal habits. For some years the "Home" received children of both sexes ; but it has been judged advisable to restrict it to girls, who have fewer opportunities of success in life than boys, and thus also to avoid the risks and difficulties that might spring out of the mingling of boys and girls of such a class. Accordingly the last of the boys has just been provided for, and there now remain six girls, of whom two are of an age to leave the institution when an opportunity offers. The girls are trained for domestic service, and it is pleasing to know that out of six who have been placed out, all except one are doing well. We feel sure that a visit to the "Home" would gratify those of our readers who take an interest in the well being of their fellow creatures, for it will afford them a proof of what may be done by Christian effort for the most unpromising children, the very pariahs of our community. We regret that the income of this institution is by no means equal to its expenditure, and that it is burdened by a considerable debt to the treasurer ; but we look forward to the time when, being better known and appreciated, its income will be so increased as to admit of much more usefulness. The committee have been unable to fill up vacancies in the "Home" for the last year, but they are anxious now to enlarge their number, if they can obtain support for a few more children. The premises would accommodate 18 or 20, and the cost of additional objects of charity would not be great – say from £10 to £11 each. We may take the opportunity of mentioning that cast off clothes would be very acceptable.

128 June 19 1869

UPTON-ON-SEVERN

DROWNING On Monday, a young woman 18 years of age named Mary Ann Hayes, a servant in the employ of Mrs Cooke of the Royal Oak Inn in this town, left her service about half past nine o'clock at night. She had had some drink, and seemed to be in a very excited state of mind when she left her home. Search was made for her the same night by her aunt, Mrs Reynolds, and a young man named Griffin, who kept company with the girl, but nothing was heard of her until the next morning about five o'clock, when a boatman named **Sheppard** found a hat and jacket on the bank of the Severn near Hanley Quay, belonging to the missing girl, and which she was seen wearing on the previous night. **George Griffin**, a waterman of this town, went to search the river near where the clothes had been found, and soon discovered the body of the poor girl. An inquest was held by Mr H B Marsh at Hanley Quay on Wednesday, and the jury returned a verdict "that the deceased destroyed herself by drowning, being at the same time in an unsound state of mind".

129 June 19 1869

UPTON-ON-SEVERN PETTY SESSIONS YESTERDAY (THURSDAY)

A LUCKY ESCAPE **James Knight**, boatman, and Robert Williams, labourer, both of Tewkesbury, appeared on bail charged with stealing a chine of bacon of the value of 7s, the property of Mr Thomas Allard, farmer of Ripple, on the 10th instant. The prosecutor did not appear, and the prisoners were discharged with a caution.

130 July 10 1869

SHOCKING ATTEMPT AT WIFE MURDER AT HANLEY A boatman on the Trent and Mersey Canal named **Thomas Vaughan** made a determined effort to murder his wife on Saturday morning at Etruria, near Hanley. He had been drinking two days at a place called Longport, about two miles off, and his wife walked after the boat from that place to Etruria. On her entering the boat about midnight on Friday, her husband picked up a windlass, or iron key, used to open locks of the canal,

and declaring he would kill her, struck her on the head with it several times. He repeated that he would “do” for her ; and on her falling on her knees and begging him to spare her till morning, he, again swearing he would kill her there and then, thrust her head into the cabin stove, which had no fire fortunately, and said he would have burnt her to death if there had been fire. He then threw her on the floor of the cabin, and getting on the hatchway, kicked her violently on the face and neck. She screamed “Murder” and, someone coming along, she managed to crawl from the boat to the house of the canal inspector, who took her to the infirmary. Her deposition was taken by a magistrate on Saturday, as there was not the least prospect of her recovery. Her head was a mass of bruises, and presented a most horrible spectacle – so much so that the magistrate was obliged to retire during the evidence, and one of the clerks fainted. The husband, who had been shortly before apprehended, was present, but was perfectly callous, even chuckling on seeing his wife, who was scarcely recognisable. The unhappy woman is 28 years of age, and married the prisoner at 15. She has two children, and about three weeks ago his ill usage caused premature confinement. The prisoner has served several years' penal servitude for horse stealing.

131 July 10 1869

WORCESTER AND BIRMINGHAM CANAL NAVIGATION A general assembly of proprietors of the above undertaking was held at the Star Hotel on Tuesday. Mr Edward Gem (Chairman of the Committee) presided, and there were also present Messrs Barker, Bembridge, Cornforth, Davenport, Postans, Ryland, Corbett (Stoke), Jas Watson, W J Scott, S A Carpenter, Danks, Johnson (solicitor), Hodgkinson (secretary) and H Parry.

The Chairman read the following report of the committee and statement of accounts :-

“In presenting to the proprietors the statement of accounts for the half year, we would remark that although the balance of profit and loss, £1216 16s 1d, appears less by £400 than the previous half year ending 30th November 1868, such deficiency is not occasioned by any diminution in the earnings of the canal during the last half year, which are £8229 6s, as against £8033 2s 6d in the former half year, the total revenue being £9403 17s 11d this half year, as against £9248 11s 6d in the former half year. The difference arises principally from the fact that owing to the depressed state of trade in the district, the amount paid for parochial and other rates in this half year amounts to £636 8s 7d, as against £330 in each of the two former half years. The engineer reports that the canal is in good working order. At our meeting on the 16th of April last, the Chairman laid before us a letter from Mr Hodgkinson to him, of which the following is a copy :- “I beg most respectfully to tender to you and the committee my resignation as Clerk to the Worcester and Birmingham Canal Company, which office I have held as junior and chief for forty two years. I beg to solicit the kind consideration of the committee ; although I have been in receipt of a handsome and satisfactory salary, still the expenses of a large family and other circumstances have left me with slender resources. I can only thank the committee for the kind consideration with which I have invariably been treated, and shall be most happy at all times to render any assistance that may be in my power whenever I may be called upon”. After anxious deliberation, we determined to accept such resignation, upon the conditions embodied in the following resolution :- “That, having regard to the long term of service of Mr Hodgkinson as Clerk to the Company, this committee agree (after the examination and verification of his accounts and all securities and documents) to recommend to the next general assembly to allow him, during the pleasure of the committee, £250 per annum, payable quarterly, on the express condition that his services shall be at all times at the disposal of the committee when required, and that he shall give all the information he can whenever desired and shall not, without the consent of the committee, engage in the service of any other canal company or any railway company. The words “the committee” in this resolution shall be construed to mean nine or more of the committee, as provided for by Clause 47 of 31 Geo 3 c59. We thereupon proceeded to advertise for a clerk to the Company at a salary of £350 per annum and, in answer to such advertisement, received no fewer than 144 applications. After repeated selections from these applications, we ultimately unanimously elected Mr Henry Parry of the Shropshire

Union Railways and Canal, who will be prepared to enter upon his duties early in August, and whose appointment, we hope, will be as advantageous to the company as it has been satisfactory to us. It will be for you at this meeting to sanction both the new appointment and the arrangement with Mr Hodgkinson. We are unanimous in reporting that in every point of view the arrangement is a beneficial one, inasmuch as, for a very moderate increase in your expenditure, you will obtain the benefit of the knowledge of Mr Hodgkinson, acquired in his long service with the company, as well as of the energy and varied experience of Mr Henry Parry, both in the management of railway and canal traffic”.

The statement of accounts showed as follows :- Profit and loss account – Dr : Salaries and wages, rents, interest, maintenance of canal and works and other items brought the amount to £8157 1s 10d; balance of profit and loss, £1246 16s 1d ; making a total of £9403 17s 11d. On the credit side, there was tonnage, weighing and wharfage, £8229 6s ; rents, £1174 17s 11d ; making a total of £9408 17s 11d. The balance of profit in the half year ending 31st May last was £1246 16s 1d. The general account showed on the debtor side from calls, mortgage debt and interest, suspense account and profit and loss account, and other items, a sum of £606076 5s 3 1/2d ; and on the credit side, cost of the canal and works, capital account, debts owing to the company for tonnage, rents &c to Lloyds' Banking Company, amount paid to the Receiver appointed by the Court of Chancery, together with other items, balances the account.

The Chairman said although the committee did not bring in their hands a dividend for the proprietors, yet they appeared before them with great boldness, inasmuch as they had earned, as the account would show, close upon 10s per share. It was in very safe custody, and would be for the advantage of the proprietors at some future time. A great deal of hard, honest work had been done by the committee during the half year in consolidating their affairs, and in so arranging the wharves and the general property that they might now enter, he trusted, upon a course of increased traffic, and earn a much larger dividend than they had done of late years. (Hear, hear). The excessive amount paid for rates and taxes was not owing solely to the increase of parochial and other rates, but to the fact that the Corporation, wishing that the rates should be from Christmas to Christmas, had collected 15 months' rates within the 12 months, so that the next account would be much lighter. There was only one thing which gave them regret, that was that they should be obliged to accept Mr Hodgkinson's resignation. Inasmuch as they all became less fit for work the older they grew, it was well that they should not only introduce new blood into the committee, as they had done, but also in the chief management of the concern. The committee believed that in Mr Parry they had the right man in the right place. The energy which had brought success to the concerns with which Mr Parry had formerly been connected would be devoted to their concern, and they looked forward with very great hope. If the proprietors would only have patience, and hold well to their shares and to the concern, he thought it might in a few years be what it was in former years – a large dividend paying concern. (Hear, hear). If, as he had no doubt would be the case, the same committee were elected for the next half year, every energy would be used to develop the traffic of the company, particularly when they had the assistance of Mr Parry's experience. (Hear, hear). The committee would be happy to answer any questions. He moved that the report and accounts be received and approved, and entered on the minutes. The appointment of Mr Parry, and the resignation of and arrangement with Mr Hodgkinson, would be made the subjects of distinct resolutions.

Mr Bembridge seconded the motion.

Mr Carpenter said he should like to ask two or three questions. He wished to be informed why the rents, of which he believed the land at Birmingham was the chief source, had decreased. The decrease in the half year was £40, and since 1866, £100 ; that was £200 a year. He also saw that the salaries had increased £50, the rent of the Droitwich Canal £80, and the loss on the Avon Canal £50. These were the bad bargains the old directors made for them. The bargains had this effect, that they were losing £1200 a year on the Droitwich Junction Canal, £1500 a year on the Droitwich Canal proper, and £750 on the Lower Avon Canal. These were the three charming bargains made for them many years ago, and the losses were increasing even now. There were two new items of charge

against them. Mr Gem was the receiver ; he had £300 a year for receiving the money and paying it over, and he ordered them to pay £25 to the auditor ; that was £50 a year for auditing the accounts. The accounts were very meagre, and he should like to audit them for about a quarter of the sum. Another new item was the insurance. He supposed the Court of Chancery would not take the risk of their buildings being burnt down, and they must insure them. Mr Gem's salary of £300 was omitted. Accounts were sometimes made up so that disagreeable facts should not appear. He supposed the £300 would be deducted from the £1605 Mr Gem received, but it should be explained. In the general accounts, it appeared as although they had not paid a dividend for six years, during the last half year they had paid away £220. Of course the claims were just, but it was odd that after being for six years unclaimed the dividends should all be claimed in one half year. Last half year it was stated that the profit and loss on the debtor side to the 31st May was £3407, now it was £2625, a difference of £800. On the credit side, several things were omitted in the last half year – the Worcester Canal Carrying Account £200 ; McLean, Brassey and Co, £109 ; and property purchased, £981. Of course all those things could be explained. Some information had been given to him which he should like to give to them, and ask them whether they knew such a thing was going on. He would not vouch for the truth of it, but would give them the information s it came to him. A man named **Joseph Edkins**, lock-keeper at Diglis, gauged the boats which came from the Severn, and received the money. As he was informed, there was no further gauge at all upon the canal. The tickets were signed probably at Tardebigge and one or two other places, but there was no check upon Edkins's operations at Diglis. Whatever he gauged the boats at and whatever money he received was not checked at all. That in itself was not right, but, as he was informed, the man was doing a large trade in this way ; he kept 20 or 30 horses and 30 donkeys or so, which he hired to the traders on the canal, and also found the horses' corn. He was driving a large trade in this way, which no doubt was profitable, but was it right that their paid servants should be doing this? He did not vouch for the absolute correctness of this, but he had been down to Diglis Wharf and had spoken to two or three boatmen who, with very significant smiles, said it was true. It was better to hire from Mr Edkins these donkeys, horses and corn, for what reason he would leave them to conjecture. He would leave them as men of business to say whether such a thing was right. More than that, he was informed that the animals were kept on their land and in their buildings, and that no rent was paid. When he heard whether it was true or not and whether the committee knew of it, he should be enabled to judge whether the gentleman who should know all about it was fit to receive a retiring pension. He understood that another man was doing the same thing to some extent, **Edward Waldron**, at the Blockhouse Bridge in this city. If the committee did not know these things, they should do so. He would state for the benefit of the absent proprietors the general position of the property according to his notion. It was six years since they had paid a dividend – three of these years they were under the old directors and three under the new. Under the old directors, the net revenue was £1637 9s 9d per annum ; under the new directors, it was £2900 10s 9d, very nearly double, which justified everything said of the old directors. The new directors had licked the concern into shape, and although it had got into Chancery, that might be beneficial if the fund was properly administered by the present committee. He thanked the new directors as he had done before ; they had done a very good work very quickly. Their present position of indebtedness was this – they owed £100,500 in round figures. They had owing to them by different people £7500; therefore they really owed £93000, and no more. Their income was about £3000 a year, and in 1872 when the Lower Avon Canal lease fell in, it would be £850 more, making something like £4000 a year. His idea was that under those circumstances by far the better plan was to pay off the debt. It was hopeless for him to propose a resolution, because there was no one present to support him. A short Act should be obtained, enabling them to pay off the debt by raising preference shares. There might be but a very few clauses in the Act, and it would not cost very much ; he could not see who could object to its passing. They had to pay for the receiving business £300 to Mr Gem, and £50 to Mr Harrison. (It was here explained by some of the committee that the £50 came out of the £300 ; and that it appeared in the account on this occasion because nothing could be deducted until the money was paid into court, which was not done yet). There was £300 a year to Mr Gem –

whether it was given to them in dinners, as someone said it was to be given, or some part to Mr Harrison, did not much matter – and they would take fourteen years to pay off the entire debt, which would be £4000 spent in this receivering business. They could get a short Act for less than £4000, and he was sure the proprietors would be very willing to take up shares at 6 per cent. He thought they might be freed entirely from the debt, and have a dividend of 10s, 12s or 15s a year ; their property would then be marketable, which it was not at present. He recommended them to take this matter into their serious consideration. A circular might be sent to each proprietor asking what he thought of such a scheme. The great difficulty was that the directors nominated themselves ; the election was a perfect farce. The proprietors came there like children, for the directors to do as they pleased with them. The directors appointed people who were highly objectionable, not personally, but on public grounds. He should never cease to say it was highly objectionable to keep nominating such men as Mr Horton and Mr Watson. It was almost an insult to the public that the directors should use their power in such a way. They were very respectable gentlemen ; but there was that about the management of the Birmingham Banking Company which made them very improper persons to sit at that or any other board.

The Chairman did not consider the election of the committee any farce at all, inasmuch as every proprietor had the option of attending or sending his proxy. (Hear, hear). As to the preference shares scheme, which Mr Carpenter had propounded before, the Act of Parliament, to begin with, would cost £500, and it would be very unfair to the proprietors who were unable to take up new shares to grant a preference dividend of 6 per cent to the exclusion of their shares. (Hear, hear). That, to his mind, was a sufficient objection to the scheme. As to Mr Edkins, he supposed the secretary was the proper person to answer for the conduct of their servants.

Mr Postans said the attention of the committee had been so much directed to the Worcester wharf and other properties that they had not had time to inspect the properties here. He knew nothing of what was stated by Mr Carpenter. He and other directors were at the office at Diglis the previous night, and made sundry memoranda. It was the intention of the committee, when Mr Parry commenced the performance of his duties, to overhaul everything belonging to the company in this city ; they were convinced of the necessity for it. Mr Carpenter was mistaken as to the lightness of the auditor's duties ; the accounts consisted of multifarious items involving a great amount of labour.

The Chairman said Mr Carpenter must be aware that the committee had been most anxious to put the company in a proper position with regard to its officers, and with regard to the most minute details. For that reason, they had accepted Mr Hodgkinson's resignation and appointed a man in whom they had the greatest confidence. With regard to his (Mr Gem's) salary of £300 a year, of which Mr Carpenter was so fond of talking, he explained at the last two meetings that he should place it entirely at the disposal of the committee. As to the insurance, it would be the height of folly to leave any buildings uninsured in order to save the paltry sum of £11 4s. No wise man would object to the expenditure. (Hear, hear). As to the auditing, in Mr Harrison's hands they would not pay one farthing more than the labour was worth. The committee were determined that the accounts should be sifted to the very bottom, even if they had to pay £100 a year for it. (Hear, hear).

Mr Postans said the payments on account of the Droitwich Canal varied according to the decrease or increase of the traffic. (Mr Carpenter : It is all decrease.) The committee could not help that. They had guaranteed to the two companies a certain amount per annum, and whatever sums were earned on the canals went towards making up that amount. The items were hardly the same in any two half years. Their attention was directed to the insurance of the property in consequence of a fire occurring at Worcester Wharf.

The Chairman observed, with regard to Mr Carpenter's remarks as to increased salaries, that if Mr Carpenter had called at the office he could have seen any details. Mr Harrison's certificate was a guarantee that no increase was put down which had not taken place.

Mr Carpenter said he was not bound to call at the office, and he asked for information on behalf of the 300 or 400 proprietors who were absent. They had a splendid piece of freehold land in

Birmingham, and he did not see why the rent should have decreased £200 a year. He did not say the accounts were not audited properly.

Mr Ryland said they had been getting rid of some bad tenants and making arrangements by which to get a larger revenue in future. The property was not let at present.

Mr Harrison said he was not called in to examine the accounts until the last moment, but he was anxious for an explanation with regard to the unclaimed dividends. It appeared that £221 0s 5d, the difference between the amount of unclaimed dividends in the two accounts, was absorbed on account of debts which were recorded in the last accounts as good, but which were subsequently found to be bad. Mr Harrison tendered an explanation with regard to the difference of £800 on the profit and loss account, but remarked that the accounts were not properly stated. He had nothing to do with drawing them out, but in future they should be stated in a more business like way. (Hear, hear).

Mr Johnson supplemented Mr Harrison's explanation by observing that there was a complicated arrangement made with McLean, Brassey and Co ; their account was disputed, and at length arbitrated upon, when it was found that in place of the company having to receive nearly £160 they had to pay £474. This made £634 out of the £800.

Mr Carpenter said Mr Gem, being at the head of the company, ought to know what was going on, and instead of having to call on the officials, he ought to be able to explain clearly to his (Mr Carpenter's) mind all these matters, which he could not do.

The Chairman's motion was then carried unanimously.

Mr Watson said that Mr Carpenter had been pleased to introduce his name in the phraseology for which he was somewhat remarkable, and had put it as somewhat of an insult to the proprietors that he should not be elected on the committee. The appointment was not sought by him, and he took it to be the wish of the proprietors that he should be elected. (Hear, hear). Although Mr Carpenter arrogantly assumed that he was the mouthpiece of the shareholders generally, he told that gentleman distinctly that if he knew the opinions not only of the shareholders but of the public in general upon his conduct he would take a very different course from what he did. The speaker was unfortunately connected with the Birmingham Banking Company, and he had great reason to deplore it. He joined almost at the eleventh hour, but on the part of himself and colleagues, he defied Mr Carpenter to put his finger on a single dishonourable transaction. Some of the cleverest men in Birmingham and the country were engaged for three years in a strict investigation of the matter, but they were unable to find a single blot on the whole transactions of the company. The directors put their shoulders to the wheel, unfortunately too late. Had the younger directors or even the older ones been cognisant of the position in which they were placed, the catastrophe would never have occurred. If Mr Carpenter wished to show gentlemanly feeling, he would not on every occasion revert to these things unless he found something dishonourable to base his calumnies on. He was ready at any time to meet Mr Carpenter or anyone else ; he cared not if every transaction with which he had been connected was unravelled to the very core. He deplored his connection with the bank greatly ; it had been the plague spot of his commercial life. As he had said, he joined the directorate at the eleventh hour, and he found a system which had been introduced at the earliest stages of the bank, and which then worked well. He did not approve of it, but he did not see until too late the full effect of it. He courted investigation into his connection with any public company. It was not for him to speak of any business ability he might have, but he had raised up a business in the Midland Counties which was never raised before. He was thankful to say it was successful, and he had great satisfaction in telling Mr Carpenter that among the trade there was not one man who would say that he had found one dishonourable action in the career of James Watson. (Hear, hear).

Mr Carpenter wished to reply to Mr Watson, and much confusion ensued, Mr Blakeway and Mr Carpenter speaking at the same time, and other gentlemen calling to order. Mr Carpenter said he had never accused Mr Watson of any dishonourable action, but he accused him again of public incapacity. He was unfit to sit upon that or any other board until he had cleared himself.

The discussion was stopped, and the Chairman moved the appointment as secretary of Mr Parry, who, he believed, would be of great value to the company.

Mr Ryland seconded the motion, and said he had had the opportunity of watching Mr Parry's career for 18 years. He had no doubt that the energies which had brought success to other companies with which Mr Parry had been connected would be successfully devoted to the development of the trade of their company.

Mr Carpenter thought that when there was any increase of salary, it should be given in the way of a percentage on the increased profits of the company.

The Chairman said it was understood to be the desire of the committee that the salary would not long remain at £350, but that according to the increased traffic Mr Parry obtained for them his case would be considered.

Mr Parry, in thanking the meeting for his appointment, said that success depended in a great measure on circumstances beyond his control, but he promised to exert himself to the utmost. (Hear, hear).

The Chairman moved the confirmation of the arrangement in regard to Mr Hodgkinson ; and Mr Postans, in seconding it, pointed out that Mr Hodgkinson's services would still be available to the company whenever required.

Mr Carpenter referred to the case of the secretary of the Warwick Canal, who had but a salary of £150 a year, and a retiring pension of £50. This company, being so frightfully rich, could give five times the sum. He could merely protest against it and sit down, entirely dissatisfied.

Mr Corbett and Mr Danks spoke in favour of the motion, which was carried *nem dis*.

Messrs Blakeway and Perry were appointed scrutineers of the committee list, and they reported that the whole of the votes were in favour of the old committee, who were therefore re-elected.

It was decided to hold the next general meeting at Birmingham.

Mr Carpenter proposed a vote of thanks to the committee ; and a similar compliment having been paid to the Chairman, the meeting adjourned.

132 July 17 1869

UPTON-ON-SEVERN PETTY SESSIONS YESTERDAY

SERIOUS ASSAULT **George Trotter, John Biddle, John Oakley and William Oakley** were summoned by Mr Richard Bennett, farmer of Blotheridge Green, for assaulting him in a hayfield at Upton on the 5th inst. A very bad case of assault was proved against Biddle and the two Oakleys, and they were each sentenced to one month's imprisonment. The evidence not being conclusive against Trotter, he was discharged. Mr G Bentley, solicitor of Worcester, appeared for the complainant, and Mr Reece for the defendants. All the prisoners were watermen, and the magistrates remarked that it was the worst case of assault that had been brought before them for a number of years. George Trotter was then summoned for assaulting William McClelend at the same time and place, and was fined £1 and 10s 6d costs ; in default one month's imprisonment. The money was paid.

133 August 7 1869

LEDBURY PETTY SESSIONS, WEDNESDAY AUGUST 4

WILFUL DAMAGE TO A BRIDGE **James Baylis**, travelling boatman, was summoned, on the information of James Fido, by the Gloucestershire Canal Company for wilfully and neglectfully driving his boat against a certain swing bridge at Swinmore near Bosbury, on the 15th ult. Defendant did not appear, and the formal proof of service of summons was given by PC Richard Williams. The informant fully proved the charge, and the Bench inflicted a fine of £2 and 11s 6d costs, and wished it to be generally understood by boatmen that for such offences they were liable to a fine of £5.

134 August 7 1869

EVESHAM

A BOATMAN DROWNED A man named **Berrington** was drowned in the Avon on Tuesday evening or Wednesday morning. The deceased was a boatman working for Mr George Aldington of

the Fish and Anchor, and it was customary for him at the conclusion of his day's work to sit on the side of the boat and smoke his pipe. It is presumed that he was thus engaged on Tuesday and, falling asleep, fell over the side of the boat and was drowned. The deceased was about 50 years of age.

135 August 21 1869

SEWAGE IRRIGATION AT BANBURY Banbury contains about 11,000 inhabitants. The sewage formerly polluted the Cherwell, but certain parties complained of the nuisance, and a decree of the Vice Chancellor ordered its discontinuance. The Board of Health subsequently rented a farm of 137 acres, about a mile from the town on the Northampton side of the Cherwell, over which they have since continued to pump the liquid, the quantity being 300,000 gallons in the 24 hours. The solid matter is detained in tanks, mixed with the sweepings of the streets and with ashes, and disposed of to canal boatmen, who sell it to the farmers. The rent of the farm is £616 10s. Thirty five acres were laid down with Italian rye grass, which is now in its third year. During 1868, the sales of produce realised upwards of £1300. Up to the present time for this year, the amount received has been £912 15s 10d. This sum includes successive cuttings of rye grass, mowing grass, lattermath and cabbages. There is now growing on this sewage farm a crop of mangolds (16 acres) the like of which is rarely to be met with. A great many of the roots are 24 inches in circumference, and it is impossible to guess what size they will attain before the end of the season. The field grew oats last year, after having been broken up by a steam cultivator in the autumn, was thoroughly sewaged during the winter, and the seed sown early in March. The wire worm thinned some of the rows, but the gaps were filled up by judicious transplanting in showery weather. The crop as a whole now looks magnificent, and excites the astonishment of agriculturists in the neighbourhood. Rather more than an acre of cabbages were planted last autumn. These, including sprouts, have been sold for £20. It has been found, however, that after the plants have attained a certain size, applications of sewage do them more harm than good. The soil is stiff and heavy. Possibly different results may be perceptible with regard to this and other similar crops on lighter land. Onions thrive under sewage if the liquid is not allowed to settle in pools. It has been found on this farm that carrots are tender roots and that fresh sewage causes them to rot. Parsnips, on the contrary, show no such tendency. The whole of the farm has been irrigated during the last year, with the exception of twelve acres, which have not yet been levelled for the purpose. The natural or mowing grass is much improved in quality by irrigation, and the quantity is more than double that which grows in the adjoining fields. As to the rye grass, although the crops have been excellent, it must be confessed that the plants show certain signs of feebleness in the stem and leaf, thereby indicating that the ground ought to be broken up every third year. The irrigation scheme at Banbury has, so far, proved a success. The liquid, after passing over the land, enters the Cherwell some distance below the town. No nuisance is complained of, and fish may be seen disporting in the river close to the outfall of the effluent water from the farm. It is calculated that the receipts from the farm this year will exceed those of last year.

136 August 28 1869

UPTON-ON-SEVERN PETTY SESSIONS YESTERDAY (THURSDAY)

STEALING APPLES **Charles Pumphrey**, a boatman of this town, was summoned by Mr Gregory for stealing a quantity of apples at Upton on the 22nd inst. Fined 6d, damage 2d, and costs 7s 6d. Money paid.

137 September 18 1869

KIDDERMINSTER COUNTY PETTY SESSIONS YESTERDAY (THURSDAY)

WASTING CANAL WATER **Charles Wyer**, a boatman, was charged with wasting the water of the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal on the 30th of August at the Falling Sands lock. The lock-keeper was called to prove the case. He stated that defendant took a boat through the Falling Sands lock on the above day, and neglected to drop the side paddle afterwards, whereby the water

was running to waste for eight minutes. Fined 20s and 9s costs, or in default fourteen days.

138 September 25 1869

POLICE INTELLIGENCE

SERVED HIM RIGHT **John Wiggetts**, a boatman, was charged by PC Phillips with riotous behaviour in the streets, and also with violently assaulting him in the execution of his duty. It appeared that the prisoner was disorderly in the streets late on the previous night, and using bad language ; and when the officer went to take him into custody, prisoner set upon him, kicked him in the bowels, knocked his thumb up and shamefully ill treated him. The officer however held on to his man, and succeeded in lodging him in the police station. Prisoner was sent to gaol for two months' hard labour, without the option of a fine.

139 September 25 1869

DEATHS

JEFFS September 10 at Alvechurch, aged 50, **Mr Henry Jeffs**, boatman.

140 October 9 1869

LEDBURY

INQUEST AT EASTNOR On Saturday last, an inquest was held at Tugwell Cottage, Eastnor, before Henry Underwood Esq, coroner, and a respectable jury, of which Mr Edward Jones (Eastnor) was foreman, touching the death of a labouring man named Isaac Vernon, aged 25 years. It appears the deceased went to his work all right on the Saturday previous, but having received his wages went to Ledbury, and there getting in the company of two men named **Hawkins** and Tustins, went from place to place drinking the whole night. About half past two o'clock on Sunday morning he was found, as stated by Superintendent Tanner, lying on his back at the Upper Cross, drunk and incapable, and as such was taken into custody and locked up. (It may be here stated that the coroner and jurymen expressed their unanimous opinion that the law on this point was particularly faulty, and that in all cases where men were found in an insensible state, a medical man should be called in. Deceased was taken before J Murray Aynesley Esq on Monday and discharged, but bitterly complained of his head the whole time, and once fell down in the dock. By the advice of the magistrate, he was taken to the Union and, on the following Thursday, being considered sufficiently recovered to be removed, was taken home by his wife in a donkey carriage. The same evening, about nine o'clock, he expired. Reports were prevalent that the deceased had met with ill usage from the hands of the man Tustins ; but this was denied by the police, who stated it was Hawkins, a boatman, that had been kicked. No bruises were found on his body, and the jury returned a verdict in accordance with the medical testimony of Dr Symonds, viz, that deceased died from congestion of the brain, brought on by over drinking.

141 October 16 1869

TEWKESBURY

BOROUGH REVISION A court for revising the lists of voters for the borough was held at the Town Hall before Sir William Millman, Bart, on Tuesday last.

George Mann, Smith's Lane, waterman, (Liberal) was opposed by Mr Moore on the grounds of his having had medical relief during the year. The claimant admitted having had the parish doctor to attend to his daughter at the time mentioned, but produced a receipt signed a day or so back for the amount, and when asked by the Revising Barrister who he had the money from, claimant answered in a very saucy manner, "From Mr Rice's office, to be sure ; he who I works for. I suppose if I had stole it from anyone, I should have to come and tell you all about it ; a pretty thing, indeed". Sir William having threatened him with imprisonment if he behaved so again, allowed him his vote.

142 November 13 1869

BROMSGROVE PETTY SESSIONS TUESDAY NOVEMBER 9

ASSAULT **Noah Dayus** of Worcester, boatman, who did not appear, was summoned for committing an assault upon Ernest Thompson, a labourer residing at Stoke Pound, by striking him, on the 29th ult. PC Moss proved service of the summons. Defendant was fined 11s 2d including costs, in default seven days' hard labour.

143 December 4 1869

WORCESTER WATERMEN'S CHURCH We are happy to be enabled to state that the grant has not been withdrawn from this meritorious institution ; and we trust, accordingly, that nothing will occur in any way or degree to interfere with its course of usefulness.

144 December 11 1869

POLICE INTELLIGENCE

ASSAULTING THE POLICE **William Walker**, a waterman, was charged under a warrant with fighting in Lowesmoor on the 27th ult, and afterwards assaulting PC Willis. A man named Rutter was apprehended at the time and convicted. Defendant said he was in bed "about the present time" that the policeman spoke about. The constable swore positively to the man, and said that he bit him severely on the finger. Remanded till Friday.

145 December 18 1869

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

THE WATERMEN'S CHURCH

TO THE EDITOR OF BERROW'S WORCESTER JOURNAL

Sir – Some reference was made to the Watermen's Church in the newspapers of the 4th inst. Allow me to say that the Church Pastoral Aid Society is only withdrawing its grant from the Watermen's Church because it no longer fulfils that purpose. The committee of the society is quite willing to continue it to the "Davis Memorial Church", for so it should be called, and under that name it was erected. If a district could be connected with it – for instance, if a thousand people who are to be found in Dolday, Newport Street and the parish of St Clement on that side the Severn, and a thousand people from the Moors, who add literally nothing to the congregation of All Saints' and St George's Churches, were attached to the "Davis Memorial Church", where the Gospel is preached without money and without price, and all the sittings are free and unappropriated, this really poor man's church would be continued, and the people would have a suitable church and ministrations.

Allow me to say further that the Rev F G Lugard, the Rector of St Clement's, has done, and is doing, all he can to continue the usefulness of the so called "Watermen's Church", and to him, therefore, the congregation are greatly indebted.

Yours truly,

OBSERVER