8 An inspector calls: Policing the "great towns" after 1856

THE 1856 COUNTY and Borough Police Act, which established a police inspectorate, was part of a wider set of changes in the criminal justice system of England and Wales, all of which impacted on local policing.[1] Policing was still viewed as a local government function, and although the inspectors appointed under this act did not have the powers to enforce their recommendations, their reports (and the threat of failing to gain a Treasury grant), added a new dynamic into the process of police development.[2] With a brief exception, all three towns were deemed efficient and in the latter part of the third quarter of the nineteenth century later historians have identified the emergence of stable forces in Leeds and Sheffield.[3] However, as will become clear, there were problems of wastage, ill-discipline and sickness that qualify these judgements of efficiency and stability.

All three forces grew substantially in absolute terms but population growth (and particularly in Bradford boundary extensions) meant that police/population ratios did not improve significantly overall. There was no hard and fast rule but a ratio of 1:800 was deemed appropriate by HMICs and the Home Office for 'great towns.'[4] By that yardstick, all three towns fell short much of the time.

10.5920/policedSociety.8

Table 8.1: Police establishment in Bradford, Leeds & Sheffield, 1861-1901

		Bradford		Leeds		Sheffield
	Force strength	Population ratio	Force strength	Population ratio	Force strength	Population ratio
1861	119	1:892	228	1:756	191	1:969
1871	159	1:917	301	1:861	280	1:857
1881	220	1:832	400	1:773	330	1:834
1891	256	1:845	423	1:869	385	1:842
1901	390	1:710	507	1:846	515	1:794

Source: Annual Reports of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Constabulary

Bradford

The one-time boom town continued to grow rapidly and there were significant boundary changes in Bradford in 1882 and especially 1897. The area policed by the Bradford force expanded tripled, from 6,590 acres in 1861 to 22, 843 in 1901, which necessitated the building of new police stations. In 1861, as well as the main station, there were another four stations – in Great Horton, Little Horton, Bowling and Manningham. In 1891 there were seven – New Leeds, Allerton and Heaton, having been added. By 1901 there were twelve – with new stations at Low Moor, Idle, Tong, Thornton, Heaton and Frizinghall, Initially, there had been a sergeant in charge of each station but by the end of the century the senior officer was a sub-inspector. Improved communications and information sharing were necessary responses and were facilitated by the creation of a four divisional structure, with each division under a superintendent. The more complex, but interdependent, force required a different skill set. Finding men with the appropriate administrative-cum-managerial skills was not easy for much of the last quarter of the nineteenth century. The structure of the force became more complex in other ways. In the 1870s there were three pay grades for constables and sergeants and a merit class. By the end of the century five pay grades for sergeants and ten for constables, including a long service class, in addition to the merit class.[5] Advancement through the grades was still seen as an incentive for appropriate good behaviour. The appointment of

Superintendent C J Paul as chief constable in 1894 was seen as living proof that an able officer could work his way to the very top but he was very much the exception.

The importance of leadership has received more attention from historians of late.[6] Increasingly managerial and administrative skills were required of men who had spent much of their careers as 'thief takers,' or at least 'drunk arresters.' In Bradford, Paul followed two long-serving chief constables: Frederick Grauhan (1859 -74) and James Withers (1874 -94), the latter having been previously being chief constable of Huddersfield. Grauhan came to Bradford with both military and police experience. He had worked his way up to an inspector in Manchester and superintendent in Leeds before becoming chief constable but remained as much a 'thief taker' as a manager. Even as chief constable, he was involved periodically in police action. Indeed, an injury sustained when 'quelling a disturbance among the Irish of Silsbridge-lane' contributed to his retirement on the grounds of ill health.[7] Although never criticised in the official annual reports, there were growing local criticisms in the early 1870s that his experience was too military and his focus on discipline too narrow for a chief constable.[8] Expectations had changed and Grauhan's successor, Withers, appeared a more rounded man and had a successful recent record at Huddersfield. He was held in high regard by local politicians, especially in the earlier years of his period of office. Nonetheless, there were unresolved problems, notably of indiscipline, notwithstanding improvements in terms of retention. Withers last year was overshadowed by an embezzlement scandal involving one-time chief clerk, James Woodman, who had just been appointed chief constable of Reigate. Behind the respectable façade was a personal tragedy which resulted in a five-month prison sentence with hard labour for crimes committed over a period of four years.[9] The case reflected badly on Withers who had frequently praised Woodman, though blame also attached to a watch committee that presided over a force 'notoriously underpaid in the higher ranks.'[10] But as with Grauhan, expectations had changed over the years. It fell to Wither's successors to tighten-up administrative procedures (chief constable Paul) and bolster morale and improve instruction (chief constable Ross).[11]

Important as the chief constable could be, more depended on the collective qualities of senior officers and particularly of the ordinary constables and their immediate superior officers. The Bradford police force was consistently

adjudged to be efficient by HMIC but behind the positive – and often formulaic – judgements were indications that all was not well. The length of beats in the town were criticised repeatedly until the early 1870s. In the same period, the low quality of recruits was highlighted on more than one occasion, as were questions about the drill skills and the quality of the police estate.[12] In 1873, it was explicitly stated that 'day duty was very inadequately provided for.'[13] Thereafter, the comments were less critical, though as late as 1894 the force was adjudged 'hardly … large enough for so important a place.'[14] Only three years later was it augmented.

Table 8.2: Bradford police annual variations, 1886/9 – 1895/9

	Average force size	Total variations	Resig-nation	Dismissal	Pension	Discharge with gratuity	Died	Total variation as %
1886-9	240	55	32	12	6	1	4	5.6
1890-4	251	81	23	17	26	9	6	6.3
1895-9	269	71	19	17	26	1	8	5.3

Source: HMIC annual reports

There were signs, however, that some of the major problems seen in the mid-nineteenth century were being overcome. Variations in the last years of Grauhan's period of office stood at about 20 percent. As many men (nine) were dismissed in 1873 as were pensioned and twice as many (twenty) resigned.[15] His successor, Withers, was fortunate in that his term of office, during which overall variations were halved, coincided with worsening economic conditions that eased recruitment and retention pressures. Resignations fell in both absolute and relative terms from the mid-1880s onwards and there was a marked increase in the number of men pensioned in the 1890s. Inevitably there were short-term variations, most notably for dismissals, which were above average in 1887, 1892 (when resignations were also above average) and 1895, but the longer-term trends were clear. In quantitative terms, variations as a percentage of the overall force were marginally lower than in Leeds or Sheffield, though it would be naïve to conclude that Bradford policemen were more disciplined.

Dismissals were the tip of a wider problem of indiscipline which can be seen from an examination of the disciplinary report books and the constables'

defaulters' book, which covers the years from 1870.[16] Responsibility for disciplinary matters was shared between the chief constable and the watch committee with only the more serious cases going before the latter. Disciplinary matters were considered thoroughly, as can be seen from the detailed reports and the marginal comments thereon. The number of men disciplined remained high for many years. In the mid-1880s at least a third of the force was reported annually for a breach of discipline. There was some improvement in the following years but the figure still hovered around 30 percent a decade later. In around 10 percent of cases a satisfactory explanation led to no further action being taken and in a handful of cases, personal circumstances were taken into account. PC Briggs was excused for failing to report his night leave to the Bowling police station on the grounds that his child had died. PC Ruttey was excused for being late on duty because he had been with his mother who was 'very ill and not expected to live long.' PC Standage, however, was cautioned for being late on duty even though his wife was ill. The chief constable's marginal note tersely stated: 'Cannot have men stopping off when they like.'

A minority of offences for which action was taken appear trivial – failing to report to the tailor for new trousers or wearing the wrong uniform. Others were more serious, varying from being late for parade – both morning and afternoon, and often for by as much as thirty minutes or more – to neglect of duty in various forms. Some men were simply absent from their beat, usually during the early hours of the morning and more so in the winter months; some found in shelters, others in the local bakery and brewery. A significant minority (approximately 20 per cent of the total) were either found asleep, drinking or drunk on duty. These more serious breaches of discipline, often resulting in dismissal, highlight the everyday pressures and temptations of the job. PC Marshall found the cold so unbearable that he left his beat to find a cup of coffee. PCs Anderson, Bloom and Parkers, on separate occasions, found the lure of a pint with the watchman at the Peel Park Brewery irresistible. Old shortcomings reappeared in new guises. PCs Helliwell and Wilson were founding drinking at the football match at Park Avenue, PC Mattocks left his beat to go to a fried fish shop, while PC Galgour's downfall was attendance at the People's Palace, albeit when on sick leave. The impact on police effectiveness of such lapses is clear but there were other cases that had wider implications. The sight of PC Walton, vomiting in

the street or PC Scott, so drunk that he was 'scarcely able to speak,' did little for the image, let alone the effectiveness, of the force. So too, the sight of PCs Thomas, Phillips and Lane, asleep in a milk cart, on a wall and in a closet, respectively. And there were the occasional cases of sexual misconduct. A drunken PC Dixon was seen entering a brothel while a similarly inebriated PC Lane was found having 'sexual intercourse in a yard, off his beat.'

Though concerned with improving discipline, successive watch committees were essentially pragmatic in their approach, recognising both the cultural norms of the societies from which the men were recruited and the practical problems of maintaining police numbers. There was also a tendency to 'turn a blind eye,' most obviously to Christmas time drinking. First-time offenders, unless theirs was a major breach of discipline, were generally cautioned. So too were a small number of men whose last (recorded) transgression was several years earlier. Repeat offenders in the early months of their police career were likely to be dismissed or instructed to resign, but men with three or more years of service, even if more frequent and/or serious offenders were only fined and, in some cases, demoted. Whether out of concern for time and effort already invested in such men, or out of a belief in the potential of the accused constable, or out of concern about finding replacements, the chief constable and watch committee were prepared to be lenient – in some cases strikingly so. PC Balmer was found in the boiler room of Messrs Perkins & Co., 'dead drunk … quite helpless and unable to speak' in January 1888. Called before the watch committee he was fined 20s despite the fact that he already had a record of insubordination – he told the reporting sergeant: 'I don't care a Buggar *[sic]* for you or the Chief Constable.' At a time when a number of men had been dismissed for drink-related offences, PC Hargreaves was merely fined (albeit 10s) despite the fact that, while on duty, he was seen sitting in the snug of the Wheat Sheaf Inn 'with his Helmet on the table and a pint pot containing Beer in front of him' at 2.45 p.m. There were times, however, when no leniency was shown. Unusually, there was a flurry of dismissals for being 'under the influence' around Christmas 1891, while earlier that year chief constable Withers had insisted on the dismissals of men who had falsified their age when applying to join.

Thus, there were several long-serving men with poor, indeed extremely poor, disciplinary records, which raises questions about the wisdom of the approach and its impact on the efficiency and image of the force. It is

important to be realistic. The men who joined the Bradford force mostly came from a background in which their masculinity was defined in terms of physical prowess – working hard and playing hard. Few were teetotallers! One would not expect these men to have an unblemished disciplinary record but the presence of a number of multiple offenders casts doubt on official judgements. Between 1870 and 1898, 55 percent of the force had between one and four disciplinary offences on their record, 21 per cent between five and nine and 5 percent ten or more. Only one in five had a clean record. Significantly, no man with five or more offences was promoted. Poor discipline was heavily concentrated among constables, the very men patrolling the streets of Bradford. Specific examples bring home the scale of the problem. PC Albert Dewhirst was finally dismissed in 1898 after an eleven-year career in which he was reported on twenty-two occasions. A series of cautions and fines had no lasting effect on his performance. He struggled to get up for 6 a.m. parades and disliked night work, neglecting his beat several times. Other serial defaulters – Richard Hardman, John Lane and Thomas Singleton – were eventually dismissed but a few, such as Richard Allen, went on to claim their pension. Their careers, and those of others like them, were a sorry catalogue of unspectacular failures that continued over several years. And men like these were still to be found serving in the 1890s. There was an important level of continual underperformance even as the force ostensibly became more stable and efficient.

The voice of the disgruntled policeman can be heard occasionally in the disciplinary records. PC Balmer's outburst was one of a number of responses from men on disciplinary charges. Some simply offered 'no excuse,' others pleaded, promising not to offend again, if not reported, but others simply confessed to their weaknesses. PC Walton, having finished vomiting, confessed to having 'had too much tonight,' continuing 'to tell the truth I don't care about the job. I may as well as give it up.' Similarly, PC Dennison admitted that he was 'always going in and out of public houses while on duty.' Others angrily confronted their sergeants, using 'filthy' and obscene and threatening language,' according to the reports. Repeat-offender, PC Scott, somewhat enigmatically, complained of 'too much B---y F----g finger work [administration] up there' at the station in the Town Hall, but PC Thorne was unambiguous, telling Sub-Inspector Ackroyd that he would not take his 'humbug,' before accusing him of having 'had your knife in me a long time.' He

finished in belligerent tone. 'If this had been any other job than policing, you would have had to fight me before now.' For the most part, disillusionment and antagonism went unrecorded. These brief insights point to a more problematic world that persisted even during these so-called stable years.

There was also one shocking example of collective indiscipline that cast a heavy shadow over the force. In July 1895, the *Bradford Daily Telegraph* carried a brief story of a local greengrocer who appeared in court with 'both his eyes blackened … and swollen and his face … greatly discoloured.'[17] The full story did not come out for three weeks. In pouring rain, members of the Bradford police cricket team had been returning from a match at Guiseley. As they neared Bradford, two lads, who were using sacks to protect themselves from the rain, asked for a lift in the wagonette carrying the team. The driver refused and when the two boys tried to clamber abroad, 'some of the constables, who are alleged to have been "in liquor," beat them with sticks, knocking them into the road.' To make matters worse, the police cricketers stopped the vehicle, alighted and further 'ill-treated' the boys. Jonathan Green (greengrocer) and his son came to the aid of the boys only to be set upon themselves. Ellis snr was 'so bruised as to be unrecognisable the next day.' The police then took the four people to the Town Hall, where they charged them with 'loitering with felonious intent' and alleging that the boys 'were in women's clothes.'[18] After a hastily-called investigation the watch committee dismissed eight constables and a sergeant.

Behind the comforting overall judgement of HMIC was a degree of inefficiency – measured in terms of neglected beats, false reports and inebriated constables – persisting into the last decade of the nineteenth century. While the range of constabulary responsibilities increased over the years, the ability to enforce the range of laws was undermined by the shortcomings of the ordinary constables. Equally, popular confidence in the police was not enhanced by the sight of a constable asleep, let alone drunk, on duty.

Leeds

After 1856 the Leeds police force was responsible for policing the whole borough. There was a dramatic increase (c.50 per cent) in numbers in a very short period of time. The force continued to grow over time but, with the

exception of 1867/8, percentage year-on-year growth was in single figures.[19] Unlike in Bradford, the policed area remained roughly constant thereafter at c.21,500 acres. Nonetheless, the organisation became more complex, not least with the introduction of a four-divisional system (1869), each division headed by a superintendent. It also became more bureaucratic and better equipped in terms of communications, especially after Henderson's initiatives in the late 1870s.[20]

Leadership was a problem in the late 1850s. After thirty-six years' service, the long-serving chief constable, Edward Read, 'worn out by length of service,' was incapacitated as 'bodily strength and memory had failed.'[21] Notwithstanding his earlier 'great zeal and efficiency,' in the eyes of his critics, he presided over 'one of the worst forces in England.'[22] HMIC Woodford's concern with the failure to appoint 'an active, energetic and effective officer' at the head of the force was remedied in 1859 with the appointment of Stephen English, one-time superintending constable but more recently chief constable in Norwich. English was one of seven men who held the office between 1859 and 1899, none of whom served for more than nine years. English was praised for improving the discipline and physical health of the force and for saving the corporation 'the expense of two chief inspectors … previously employed,' but his tenure ended abruptly over unexplained domestic problems which led to the watch committee calling upon him to resign.[23] The impact of his immediate successor, William Bell, another military man but also deputy chief constable of Monmouthshire, was limited following a 'very severe and protracted illness.'[24] Like English he was concerned with inefficiencies in the force – high turnover of men, the prevalence of illness-related absenteeism and drunkenness – but identifying problems was easier than solving them. Improved pay and better promotion prospects depended as much on the willingness of the watch committee and Bell came up against the resistance of economically-minded councillors. A more substantial contribution to the development of the force was made by James Wetherell, who had worked his way through the ranks becoming chief constable of Oldham, before moving to Leeds in 1866. Wetherell was an able administrator, playing an important part in the development of the new divisional system, and a capable manager, credited with the appointment of several 'diligent' senior officers.[25] Yet he too, ran up against watch committee parsimony. And again, illness struck and he died in office in 1874 aged 48.

10.5920/policedSociety.8

In addition to the chance impact of illness, a further complication was the opportunity for promotion between forces. Leeds had benefitted, poaching English and Wetherell from smaller forces but it also lost out. Chief constable Henderson, by reputation a stickler for paperwork but concerned with improving information flows within the force and without, left for Edinburgh after three years, and John William Nott-Bower moved to Liverpool after a similar short period. J W Nott-Bower was succeeded by his brother, Arthur, who had risen to the rank of chief clerk in the Nottingham force. During his nine years term of office, he instigated a number of administrative reforms aimed at improving book-keeping and also improving the flow of information. The tensions between watch committee and chief constable remained. Indeed, in the last decade of the nineteenth century the chief constable (Webb) was bemoaning the lack of sufficient police numbers and the resistance of the watch committee in a manner that his predecessors would have readily recognised. Although not having a long-serving chief constable, the Leeds force was led by several able men but their impact was limited partly by their short tenure but also by watch committee parsimoniousness.

In the early years of inspection, the annual reports of successive government inspectors on the Leeds force contained several persistent criticisms of ordinary constables. Doubts remained about the number of men who 'from age and long service, seem to be pretty well worn out, and no longer capable of effectively and satisfactorily per forming their duties.'[26] Although there were signs of improvement, concerns remained about the size of the force and the length of certain beats. Despite letters to the mayor of Leeds demanding action, the watch committee responded by reaffirming their belief in the efficiency of the existing force and denying the need for increased numbers.[27] The force was expanded in the late 1860s and early 1870s but there was still 'difficulty in keeping the force up to the established strength' and, even with a full force, 'the complement of constables for day duty is less than is desirable.'[28] Criticisms diminished from the mid-1870s as the force was further expanded, albeit reactively in response to the criticisms of successive government inspectors. If, as Churchill has argued, the force was 'relatively orderly, stable and experienced' by the 1870s, it was significantly more so in the following decades.

A major problem in the late-1850s and early-1860s was the high turnover rate, especially in 1857/8 and 1858/9 when there were 105 resignations and

10.5920/policedSociety.8

seventy-four dismissals, equivalent to c.40 per cent of the force.[29] This was to change gradually but significantly in the following years.[30] Over the course of the 1860s the force grew in size from c.230 to c.280 but an average of seventy men per year were recruited, which translates to an overall variation rate of over 25 percent. The watch committee was sufficiently worried to instigate an enquiry into the high rate of turnover, especially among newly-appointed men, but with little short-term effect. In the following decade, the force grew to c.350 men but, averaging an annual recruitment of about seventy, with an overall variation rate of approximately 20 per cent. It was only in the 1880s and 1890s that significant improvements were seen, the variation rate falling to approximately 12 per cent and then below 10 per cent. Annual recruitment fell from about sixty in the 1880s to around forty in the 1890s, despite continued augmentation that took the force to 500 by the end of the century. More precise figures for the late-nineteenth century are summarised below. Voluntary resignations still accounted for a third total variation as late as 1895-9 but dismissals had fallen to 12 per cent. In contrast, pensions accounted for 40 per cent.

Table 8.3: Leeds police annual variations, 1886/9 – 1895/9

	Average force size	Total variations	Resig-nation	Dismissal	Pension	Discharge with gratuity	Died	Total variation as %
1886-9	421	30*	13	7	5	2	2	7.1
1890-4	434	35	18	4	8	1	3	8.1
1895-9	475	25*	9	3	10	0	2	5.3

Including 1 absconder

Source: HMIC annual reports

For successive chief constables and watch committees police discipline was a major concern. In the late-1850s and early-1860s the number of recorded disciplinary incidents averaged c.100 in a force of just over 220 men. A generation on, the annual average for the 1880s was sixteen. The 'collapse in disciplinary figures,' as Churchill terms it, was in part more apparent than real, as the watch committee devolved responsibility for all but the most serious matters to the chief constable and superintendents.[31] However, the

evidence of the forces conduct book suggest a real, if less dramatic, change over time.

The majority of men appointed in the mid-to-late 1850s, including those who were to move through the ranks, had a disciplinary record, quite commonly running to five or six incidents. The most common problems were being late on duty, failure to work a beat, sleeping on duty and succumbing to alcohol – the authorities even managing to distinguish between 'being in liquor,' 'rather under the influence of alcohol,' and being 'drunk on duty.' Men promoted through the ranks to senior positions, central to the management of the force, generally had a clean record. Chief superintendent and deputy chief constable, John McWilliam had an unblemished record over a career that lasted more than thirty years, as did inspector John Newhouse, whose career lasted eighteen years. Superintendent John Hunt's one indiscretion came at the outset of his career. In contrast there were very few (four in total) long-serving sergeants who had a clean record. John Verity was an exception, Appointed in October 1857, he was finally made sergeant in 1875. Though he never moved beyond the rank of first-class sergeant, he served for more than thirty years with a clean disciplinary record. Only one long-serving constable, John Wilde, was in a similar position. Yet the watch committee, and later the chief constable, adopted a pragmatic approach, sometimes dismissing men, especially early in their police careers, but more frequently offering a second or third chance to men on drink-related charges. In several cases the approach was vindicated as men went onto a long-term career. But the continued presence of other men raises doubts about the wisdom of the policy. PC (later sergeant) George Bennett had a problem with alcohol that led to a variety of cautions and fines throughout his career but this did not prevent him from being promoted to sergeant and the good conduct class. Finally, after sixteen years and twelve disciplinary offences, he was dismissed for being drunk on duty – for the fourth time. PC Ramsden's career was not dissimilar and also eventually ended in dismissal. Others, such as PCs Kenyon, Kershaw and Wood had similar records to Bennett but remained in post. The most egregious case, however, was that of Richard Glover. Appointed in January 1857 and superannuated in June 1891 (i.e. a career of over thirty years), he became a first-class constable and was promoted to both the good conduct and long service classes. All this while he amassed twenty-eight cautions, reprimands and fines for offences including not just

10.5920/policedSociety.8

neglect of duty, lateness on duty and drill, but also making false statements, not assisting a colleague in a drunken brawl and allowing a prisoner to escape. Although his record was particularly bad, he was but one of number of inefficient men who remained in post. A generation later the situation was appreciably different. The men recruited in the early-1890s were less likely to resign, much less likely to be dismissed and much more likely to have an unblemished disciplinary record: 45 per cent of these men had no punishments recorded against their names and a further 47 per cent had four or less. The frequently offending constable recruited in the late-1850s was now more of a rarity. Constables Allan Marshall and William Wray, both of whom served over twenty years despite each having eleven punishments, mainly drink-related to their names were unusual. More common were the likes of one-time farmer Tom Dixon, resident constable at Moortown for many years with an unblemished record. Quite simply, the scale of the misconduct that was evident in the 1860s had diminished significantly by the 1890s.

Overall, the Leeds force c.1900 was larger, better organised, better equipped technologically, better disciplined and more stable than its counterpart c.1860. In certain respects, it compared favourably with its late-Victorian counterpart in Bradford, if not in Sheffield. These were important advances but there were important qualifications to be borne in mind. Half the recruits from the early 1890s served for twenty years or more; but one in five still resigned in the first twelve months in the force. A pension was the career outcome for over 50 percent of the cohort; but 40 percent either resigned or were dismissed. The majority of these career policemen started and finished their careers as constables, albeit in various long-service – seven, ten, fifteen, twenty and twenty-two-years classes, but also good conduct and even an 'Exemplary Conduct and Efficiency' class. Less than a quarter were promoted and the bulk of these men only became sergeants. Although there was a growing differentiation of constables – there were seven grades of constables in 1890 – there was a growing number of men, for whom talk of promotion was meaningless. There was still the stick and carrot of movement up and down the constabulary scales but there was a cohort of older men, more experienced but physically less able over time, and with no real chance of material improvement beyond the introduction of new pay scales, as happened in 1867 and 1890 and 1901. An unknowable number

10.5920/policedSociety.8

simply worked out their days to a pension, doing enough not to risk dismissal for inefficiency but little more. In the late-1880s, the watch committed bemoaned the fact that `inefficient constables in the Force are never reported either to the Chief Constable or to the Watch Committee, unless they are guilty of some specific breach of discipline or act of misconduct.'[32] Even though the number was low (six officers were asked to resign), the persistence of unrecorded inefficiency is a further qualification to HMIC verdicts of efficiency. In addition, there was the problem of 'ordinary illnesses' – fifteen days per man per annum in the 1860s[33] – and infirmity, especially among older men. These were the men who patrolled the streets of Leeds, enforcing a range of laws that impacted most on the working-classes of the town.

Sheffield

While its population grew by some 75 percent, the policed area remained largely unchanged between c.1860 and 1900. Police numbers grew at roughly the same rate as the overall population until the rapid expansion of the late-1890s and early-1900s. During these years, the number of outstations was increased from three in 1868, to five in 1873 and six by the early 1880s, linked initially by telegraph (1874) and later by telephone (1881). The divisional structure was extended to six by the 1880s and the structure of the force, as elsewhere, became more complex. Initially senior ranks comprised a chief constable, inspectors and sub-inspectors. This was strengthened by the creation of the rank of superintendent (from 1870) and subsequently deputy chief constable and chief clerk. By 1900 there were four classes of superintendents and five of inspectors. Similarly, as the number of sergeants grew, the initial two classes were expanded to four (including a merit class) by the mid-1870s and to six by the turn of the century. Reflecting the force's earlier development, there were five classes of constable – from probationary to merit – c.1860. By 1901 there remained five classes – from probationary to first class – and then three long service classes as well as a merit class.[34]

Sheffield was unusual in having a long-serving and highly respected chief constable. John Jackson was appointed in late-1858. Having previously served in the Lancashire county constabulary, he had been chief constable of Oldham since 1849, where he gained a reputation for dynamism and

tact, in a town that had seen considerable hostility to the police. HMIC Woodford described him as 'an intelligent and zealous officer' and in a letter to the town's mayor praised Jackson's 'unwearied attention and perseverance in drilling, advising and correcting, and by the personal example which he sets at all times to those under his command.'[35] Woodford's successor, Elgee was equally fulsome, adjudging Jackson to be 'so eminently fitted for the office of Chief Constable.'[36] Twenty-five years later, HMIC Croft simply spoke of Sheffield's 'excellent chief constable.'[37] There was similar praise from members of the watch committee, which were endorsed by the local press. Following his death in office in late 1898, the *Sheffield Daily Telegraph* praised 'The People's Chief Constable.' [38] It was becoming difficult to separate the man from the myth.

Jackson's reputation rested on two very different but high-profile events. The first was the 'Great Flood' of 1864, when the Dale Dyke dam broke as its reservoir was filled for the first time. Jackson distinguished himself, displaying considerable personal courage during the initial 'inundation,' and playing a major role in organising the police response in the aftermath.[39] Th second was his contribution to the enquiry into the Sheffield Outrages. The commissioners singled out his 'great aid' and concluded that they were 'in no small measure indebted [to Jackson] for whatever success has attended our enquiry.'[40] More generally, there was no doubt as to his organisational ability and personal popularity when he appeared, usually on horseback, at ceremonial events such as royal visits. More important was his impact on police discipline and efficiency, which won him the support of successive watch committees but also of many in the force.

When HMIC Woodford conducted his first inspection in Sheffield, he found a force that he seen a significant growth in numbers but, at 177 men, was still short of the establishment of 190. Although important improvements had been achieved under the early leadership of Thomas Raynor, by 1857 he was an old man in his late 60s, exhausted by years of police work. The newly-created police sub-committee was concerned, not simply by the inefficiency of the chief constable, but of the force itself. Jackson responded to the challenge in a detailed report to the watch committee. While defending the force – 'with a few exceptions … a very fine body of men'[41] – he highlighted the high turnover rate, especially among men in the early months of service, and the problems of sickness and ill-health. In the following years he took

'every justifiable opportunity … to rid the force of inefficient and worthless men,' which, in the eyes of watch committee members, meant that 'no police force … has been so greatly improved.'[42] Jackson established a good working relationship with the police sub-committee and the watch committee in the 1860s and sustained it in following decades, which bore fruit in the limited opposition in council to proposals to augment the force. There was an 'economical' faction but, unlike in Leeds, there was no attempt to reduce the size of the force. Criticism of wasteful expenditure was largely confined to over-fancy buttons and elaborate braid on senior officers' uniforms.

Relations with HMIC Woodford were good with the exception of a serious breakdown in communication which led to the force being deemed inefficient in 1863 and 1864. This, according to Williams, was more bureaucratic than real.[43] There is, however, a danger of downplaying the problem. Even when the numbers were increased, 'after so long an interval,' as Woodford tartly observed, they were only 'sufficient for the ordinary duties of the borough.'[44] Further, numbers were again criticised as 'insufficient to provide constables for the whole of the beats' in the annual reports for 1871 and 1875. As late as 1896 another government inspector drew attention to Sheffield's relatively poor standing in relation to other large towns.[45]

A more stable force, comprising men for whom policing was a long-term career, gradually came into being but Jackson had inherited a promising situation. As early as 1859, the average length of service for inspectors and sub-inspectors was twelve years, for sergeants was almost ten years, for constables in the merit class just short of nine years and just over five years for first-class constables.[46] By the mid-1870s 40 per cent of the force had between five and twenty years' experience with a further 5 per cent (past their physical prime) with twenty years' or more experience.[47] A further positive sign was the percentage of men receiving a pension. In 1875 there were only nineteen men on the superannuation scheme as a whole. By 1895-99, almost half of total variations was for men taking their pension.[48] Jackson was undoubtedly concerned with improving the efficiency of the force but he relied heavily on other able senior officers, notably superintendent, later deputy chief constable, Mackley, an accountant by training, whose 'really excellent' book-keeping was used as a model by HMIC Elgee. The reputation of the force as one of the best organised and disciplined force in the northern district rested

10.5920/policedSociety.8

on the combination of able senior officers and experienced constables. But a good reputation did not mean that there were no problems.

Like other forces, Sheffield faced a retention problem, especially in the third quarter of the nineteenth century, with variations ranging from about 25 percent in the early 1860s and falling to 15 to 20 percent a decade later.[49] Ignoring the suspiciously low 1886-9 figure, the statistics for the 1890s show a clear improvement. Even so, as many men were dismissed or resigned as were pensioned; and for every man dismissed, three resigned voluntarily.

Table 8.4: Sheffield police average annual variations, 1886/9 – 1895/9

	Average force size	Total variations	Resig-nation	Dismissal	Pension	Discharge with gratuity	Died	Total variation as %
1886-9	360	9	4	1	2	0	2	2.5
1890-4	400	25	8	4	11	0	2	6.3
1895-9	428	26	9	3	12	0	2	6.1

Source: HMIC annual reports

Jackson consistently spoke of the importance of enforcing discipline to make 'the police force thoroughly efficient.'[50] The contrast between the opening years of his tenure as chief constable with the latter years of his predecessor was striking. In the mid-1850s, despite concerns about police indiscipline, a mere 6 per cent of the force was punished (and only 1 per cent dismissed or ordered to resign) whereas in 1860 the overall figure was 16 per cent, with 5 per cent (that is nine men) removed from the force.[51] Jackson stamped his authority on the force in these years. By the mid-1860s the figures for dismissal and other punishments had fallen to level last seen in the 1850s and by 1870 all punishments were at an all-time low. In the opinion of the watch committee this was evidence of a more disciplined body of men. There were periodic short-term concerns about drunkenness in the force – notably in 1874, 1877, 1881 and 1891 – and the need to 'keep members of the force out of temptation.'[52] There was always an element of pragmatism in the watch committee's approach. In 1881 it stressed that it was 'very anxious to prevent their officers from getting *too much* drink,' while recognising that the men were 'only fallible.'[53] By the last decade of the century the watch committee reported, with a sense of satisfaction, but also relief, that there

had been 'no reports of drunkenness or misconduct [among constables] for the last few months.[54] But behind this rosy official image some awkward facts occasionally came to light that suggested a certain laxity in matters of discipline. A high-profile case involving serious neglect of duty by detective officer Leonard in 1865 led to criticism of the decision merely to demote the man to first-class constable rather than dismiss him.[55] Two years later the watch committee was heavily criticised for not taking appropriate action in the case of two detectives guilty of false imprisonment.[56] In 1874, a sergeant found guilty of lying about the conduct of a fellow officer was again demoted rather than dismissed. Questioned by alderman Hutchinson, alderman Harvey defended the watch committee's decision on the grounds that he had 'only once been out of order' in an eight-year career and that the loss of income was 'very harsh treatment.' Further, in what might have been intended as a light-hearted comment, he continued that 'if they were to discharge everyone who told untruths,' many men would have to be dismissed.[57] More disturbing were the revelations of (financial and liquid) 'treating' of constables by a local 'liquor firm,' Duncan Gilmour & Co., at Christmas time that came to light shortly after Jackson's death.[58] For several years previous there had been claims that the relationship between the town's drink interest, the watch committee and the police were too close but they were dismissed by members of the watch committee and the 'paragon' that was Jackson. It subsequently transpired that Gilmour had been a member of the watch committee, that the firm employed a superannuated ex-sergeant in the Sheffield force to distribute the Christmas treats – 'not in any way given as a bribe, but merely as recognition of services rendered'[59] – and that the practice date back over forty years. Although not on the same scale as the contemporaneous bribery scandal in the Manchester force, this episode suggests a greater degree of collusion than earlier denials had suggested.

Even in the problematic years of the late-1850s and early-1860s, resignations had been a greater problem than dismissals but both disciplinary and retention issues were related to the quality of the men recruited, which in term was linked to questions of pay, pensions and conditions of work. There was, as alderman Saunders told the town council in 1859, 'not sufficient inducement for good men to stay.'[60] It was a concern repeatedly heard over the following decades. 'It has latterly been very difficult to obtain thoroughly competent men for the force, or to retain them,' the watch committee concluded in

10.5920/policedSociety.8

January 1872 and offered by way of explanation 'the greater inducements held out to them in other avocations.'[61] Committee members were clear that to attract men 'whose intelligence and character [is] superior to those of an ordinary labourer,' it was necessary to offer more than 'the wages of an unskilled workman.'[62] Two months later it noted that 'resignations are taking place faster than men can be got to fill the vacancies.'[63] Alderman Gurney made clear that 'the number of men who were continually leaving the force prove that the wages were not a sufficient inducement for them to remain.'[64] Nor was the situation helped by the fact that 'opportunities of promotion and advancement to higher grades [were] few in number.'[65] Unsurprisingly in their evidence to the 1872 select committee on police superannuation funds both HMIC Elgee and chief constable Jackson stressed the difficulties of recruitment and retention.[66] Notwithstanding a number of pay increases, there remained a worry that Sheffield police were underpaid in relation to their counterparts, not just in Leeds, Liverpool and Manchester but also in Rotherham.[67] The problem had been exacerbated in the early years by the practice of stopping the pay of men on sick leave, 'causing good men to leave the service and demoralising many who remain.'[68] According to figures supplied to the watch committee by Jackson in 1863, on average nine men (just under 5 percent of the force) were sick and unfit for work daily.[69]

Throughout these years there were recurring demands for improved wages that drew on a variety of arguments that highlighted the dangers of the job, the rising cost of living, especially in the 1870s, and, increasingly, injustice stemming from higher wages paid in other urban forces. The seemingly obvious answer, increased wages, was not self-evident at the time. Alderman Mycock, chair of the watch committee, and a long-term member of the police sub-committee was clear that 'it was of the utmost importance that the interest of the ratepayers should be considered as well as the interests of the members of the police force.'[70] Further, he doubted that 'the police [were] more subject to disease or injury than an artisan.'[71] From a very different perspective, councillor Schofield, a Democrat, had no doubt that 'the wages given to the police were adequate' while 'thousands of mechanics in Sheffield … were working for less.'[72] Even sympathetic councillors had to be convinced that the time was right. In 1880, 'Considering the depression existing throughout the county,' alderman Harvey told fellow councillors, 'now was not the proper time to raise [police] salaries.'[73] Others such as councillor

Saunders simply denied that the Sheffield police were not well-paid relative to other forces, or like alderman Wood, felt the men 'wanted the wages but did not want to earn them.'[74] Others, like alderman Rawson simply saw no need to improve wage levels as he had seen policemen 'gossiping together in the daytime.'[75] Perhaps more fundamental, was the unresolved contradiction in the widely-held perception of the police. On the one hand, they were bracketed with labourers – there was strong belief was that agricultural labourers in particular made ideal recruits –but on the other there was an expectation that they would behave in an exemplary manner, showing skills of interpersonal conduct and record keeping not associated with unskilled workers.[76] In other words, as a growing number of councillors realised, 'to attract [men of] intelligence and character, higher inducements must be offered than the wage of an unskilled workman.'[77]

Not simply because of its salience in police memorials requesting an increase in wages, watch committee members looked closely at the question of comparative pay but what might have seemed a simple question – how much was a policeman or sergeant paid in any given force? – was not easily answered because of the complexities of pay scales and the lack of uniformity between forces and the lack of synchronicity in awarding pay increases across forces. The forces in all three towns (Sheffield, Leeds and Bradford) had five classes of sergeants, each with its own pay level. Sheffield had four classes of constable, Leeds seven and Bradford four. To make matters worse, Sheffield had constables on seven different pay levels in the first class, Leeds had men on two different pay levels in all classes, except the lowest 6th class, and Bradford had two different pay levels for merit-class constables, four for first-class constables and three in both the second- and third-class. The following table captures some of this complexity. The figures do not fully support the claim of the Sheffield police that there was a long-standing injustice in terms of pay but there was no gainsaying recurrent pressure from below. The watch committee generally acted pragmatically, conscious of the balance to be struck between overall numbers, levels of pay and leave entitlement. At times, it, and its policing sub-committee responded to the various demands and pressure for increased pay in an *ad hoc* manner (as in 1865, 1870, 1873 and 1878). At others it overhauled the whole pay structure as in 1872, 1875, 1890 and 1901.[78]

10.5920/policedSociety.8

Table 8:5 Wage rates (shillings per week) for constables and sergeants in Bradford, Leeds & Sheffield, 1859 - 1900

	Sheffield	Leeds	Bradford
1859 Sergeant	23s	22s	21s
1859 Constable	16s to 22s	18s to 21s	17s to 19s
1870 Sergeant	26s	24s to 29s	24s to 27s
1870 Constable	20s to 23s	19s to 24s	20s to 23s
1880 Sergeant	32s 2d to 34s 2d	31s to 33s	30s 2d to 36s 2d
1880 Constable	24s to 28s 8d	24s to 28s 2d	23s to 29s 2d
1890 Sergeant	32s 2d to 35s 2d	33s to 37s	30s 6d to 39s
1890 Constable	24s to 29s 10d	25s to 35s	23 to 31s
1900 Sergeant	33s 3d to 39s 6d	34s to 42s	32s to 40s
1900 Constable	24s to 32s 8d	24s to 36s	24s to 35s

Source: HMIC annual reports

Pay was of particular importance to recently-recruited men but as their period of service lengthened the question of a pension came more to the forefront, and not simply in Sheffield. Despite the advocacy of HMIC Woodford, Sheffield did not introduce a police superannuation fund until 1860 when amending legislation to the 1856 County and Borough Police Act made it compulsory. Advocates of change, such as Dr Hudson, saw a police pension as a necessary part of the creation of a stable and efficient force. Councillor Beal argued it would end the force's current state of 'being continually effervescing,' but also stressed the morality of a superannuation scheme. For men who had served the corporation to be 'cast adrift … with nothing but the parish to look after [him]' would be 'an injustice and a shame.'[79] But others differed. Councillor Saunders, well-known for his opposition to the new police arrangements added a different moral perspective, arguing that as the police were properly paid, they should be left to 'take care of themselves … because the more men were cared for by others the less they would care for themselves.'[80]

The pension rights granted under the 1859 police pension act were limited. No pension was to be awarded to a man under sixty years of age, unless, on medical advice, the chief constable certified him to be 'worn out or disabled.' It was repeatedly stressed that 'the constable's right to an allowance is not absolute.'[81] There was ongoing criticism of the police superannuation fund, critics seeing it as 'the biggest of all the abominations the town had,' which was reflected in the close scrutiny of the allowances proposed by the

watch committee.[82] More generally within the council, there was support for the scheme, not least because it was particularly well funded. Local considerations, however, were overtaken by a nation-wide campaign for reform which saw a select committee established in 1872 to consider the matter. Giving evidence, Jackson gave a positive view. The council had acted 'in an exceedingly liberal spirit,' and he was 'satisfied with the existing provision [for] men who have become incapacitated either mentally or bodily.'[83] However, he was forced to concede that there was 'strong feeling in the force,' especially among younger men, in favour of a pension for service 'irrespective of age or of mental or bodily infirmity.'[84] He also saw the size of the superannuation fund as 'amply sufficient to account for the men's dislike of the fund as at present established and administered.' Jackson also argued that 'more liberal allowances… [were] needed to secure active, healthy, intelligent men for the force and to retain those now in it.'[85] A similar view was given by chief constable Henderson of Leeds, who acknowledged that 'the great amount of uncertainty and dissatisfaction … among the men' and was firmly of the view that change was needed to improve retention.[86]

Among some witnesses from the ranks there was a sense of betrayal as newspaper adverts for police recruits had made bogus claims of 'a liberal retiring pension after 15 or 20 years' service.'[87] PC Robert Nichols, a constable in Sheffield for over eight years, was less forceful but nonetheless attested to the strength of feeling within the ranks for a service-based scheme and to the importance of an improved pension scheme for retention and efficiency.[88]

The practical impact locally was negligible. The council remained determined to retain and exercise its powers. Notwithstanding the complaints that had been made, the policy of granting pensions at the minimum age of sixty was continued. In the following years a sorry procession of long-serving but 'worn out' men were considered, such as inspector Samuel Smith, who had served for thirty-three years before he was deemed eligible for superannuation and approved for retirement.[89] The demand for the right to a pension was finally met in 1890 and, unsurprisingly, was followed by a large batch of retirements. The impact upon the number of resignations or the level of rank-and-file dissatisfaction is not recorded but the retention of long-serving men, especially those not moving beyond the rank of constable and probably suffering from indifferent, if not poor, health, cannot have added to the efficiency of the force, even allowing for the experience they brought to the job.

10.5920/policedSociety.8

Some conclusions

The mid- and late-Victorian years witnessed important developments in the policing of the three 'great towns' in the West Riding. The forces became larger, more complex and more bureaucratic and with a wider range of responsibilities. The process of experience accumulation – explicitly noted in Sheffield in the late-1850s – continued and quickened through the last quarter of the nineteenth century as wastage rates fell. A further complicating factor was the changing relationship between watch committees and chief constables. Policing was still seen as a local (rather than national) responsibility but it was no longer possible for local councillors to exercise the close and detailed control, particularly over discipline, seen in earlier years – and still found in some smaller forces. The presence of an experienced and long-serving chief constable – Jackson in Sheffield, Withers (to a lesser extent) in Bradford – facilitated this process but even in Leeds the chief constable was dealing with all but the most serious disciplinary matters by the mid-1880s. More generally, the working relationship between watch committee and senior police officers was pragmatic but not always productive. There were still local politicians who were reluctant to support expansion in police numbers on the grounds of economy, more so in Leeds, even Sheffield, than in Bradford, but there were no campaigns to reduce the number of policemen as had been seen in the mid-nineteenth century.

At the same time, expectations of the police at all levels changed, higher standards were expected and new skill sets required. Chief constables required managerial, rather than simply military, skills, particularly as they came more dependent on superintendents responsible for the various out-stations. They also needed the support of 'office staff' with clerical and accounting skills to ensure books were properly kept, communications maintained or improved, and information accurately and promptly disseminated. By the turn of the century, if not before, the chief clerk was a key figure. More research remains to be done on the detailed work of 'senior management teams' but their overall importance was not in doubt. Also of considerable importance was the sergeant, the last link in the extended management chain. Superintendents and inspectors tended to be more able, better disciplined and more ambitious. The situation was more problematic among sergeants. In addition to problems of frustrated ambition – and few

10.5920/policedSociety.8

men gained more than one promotion – there was the question of ability and aptitude. A significant minority of men promoted to the rank of sergeant found themselves demoted, or even asking themselves to be reduced in rank. By the end of the century there was a growing awareness that experience of working a beat was not sufficient but it was not until the early twentieth century that more resource was put into training would-be sergeants.

Particularly in the 1870s, the forces faced severe difficulties in finding a sufficient number of suitable recruits. Particularly in Bradford, recruits were deemed to be sub-standard; more generally, it was difficult to maintain authorised strengths. Pay rates linked to those of a notional agricultural labourer, a buoyant local and regional economy, let alone the dangers and isolation of the job, restricted the flow of recruits. Watch committees advertised for men in low-wage districts, from Aberdeenshire to Cumberland, Westmorland, and Lincolnshire. By the last quarter of the nineteenth century recruitment was less problematic. In part this was a product of improved retention, which reduced the volume of recruits needed to maintain establishments, but it also reflected wider economic changes beyond the control of local police authorities. Recruitment was merely the start of the process. Retention was a major problem in the mid-nineteenth century as large numbers of men resigned, often within days and months of joining. By the 1880s and 1890s the number of men resigning had dropped considerably. The relative (un)attractiveness of police pay changed as watch committees improved pay rates and as the prosperity of certain trades waned . The attraction of a pension became more important after the 1890 police pension act. Probably, though it is almost impossible to prove, recruits were better supported in their early careers as the number of longer-serving men increased and recruits were less unaware of the demands of the job as more men became policemen. Whatever the mix of reasons, as fewer men resigned, particularly in the early months, the pressures on recruitment were eased, less police time was wasted on unproductive training, and more stable forces emerged.

More striking was the reduction in the number of dismissals, particularly in Leeds and Sheffield, which suggests a long-term improvement in discipline. The figures, however, need to be treated with care, not least as the criteria for dismissal were not necessarily consistent between forces or over time. More important, incidents warranting dismissal were the tip of a disciplinary iceberg. Occasionally noted briefly in inspector's annual reports, police

10.5920/policedSociety.8

conduct books bear witness, in all three towns, but more so in Bradford, to the continuing problem of indiscipline, often involving serial offenders, which impacted on the efficiency, and in some cases the public image, of the force. Indiscipline was also part of a wider problem of inefficiency, some of which went unrecorded or simply escaped documentation. Data relating to days lost to sickness are scattered but occasional estimates show as much as 5 percent of a force could be on sick leave at any one time. Similarly, the number of men, worn out physically and mentally, and eventually pensioned, is indicative of a larger problem of inefficiency at work. The short-term upsurge of men retiring on a pension in the early 1890s reinforces this point. Finally, the occasionally-recorded grumble of a discontented constable points to another source of inefficiency among men disillusioned with their job, lacking an obvious alternative occupation, and waiting for a pension. The annual HMIC inspection, enthusiastically reported in the local press, had an important propaganda purpose. The sight (or report) of smartly-dressed and seemingly fit men performing well-drilled exercises helped reinforce a positive public image of the police but behind the sturdy figure of a cheerful, avuncular policeman, bringing order to the streets, was (albeit in a minority) an arthritic or inebriated officer doing the minimum required. None of this is to dispute long-term improvement in all three forces but this change is better understood in terms of reducing inefficiencies. As many late-Victorian senior officers realised, there was a job to be done in improving the education and training of the next generation of policemen and not just in the West Riding.[90]

10.5920/policedSociety.8

Endnotes

1 Transportation was being phased out, a new sentence (penal servitude) was introduced, new prisons were being built and there was a significant extension of summary justice.

2 The impact of the inspectorate varied considerably, depending on the men in post. Despite having been chief constable of Lancashire, John Woodford, the inspector for the northern district was something of a disappointment, his later annual reports becoming formulaic and repetitive. His successor William Elgee, also a chief constable of the Lancashire force, was more thoughtful and active. Much also depended on the attitudes and actions of politicians and civil servants. Whereas Home Secretary, Richard Cross, seeking to exploit the raising of the Exchequer grant to 50 per cent in 1874, hoped to secure 'a greater amount of supervision and control over the police forces of Great Britain,' his successor, William Harcourt expressed his faith in local politicians and their understanding of local needs and condemned the inflexibility of the 'Procrustean rules of the Inspectorate.' The *History of Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary: the first 150 years*, 2006 at the-history-of-hmic-the-first-150-years.pdf (justiceinspectorates.gov.uk)

3 Leeds in the late-1860s and Sheffield in the 1870s. Churchill, 'Crime, Policing and Control,' and Williams, 'Police and Crime.'

4 There were significant variations over time. During the early 1860s, particularly during the dispute between the Home Office and the Sheffield watch committee, a figure of 700:1 was mentioned in correspondence yet in 1880 reference was made to the 'government rule' of 1:800 for great towns.

5 HMIC annual reports. By 1899 there were also five pay grades for inspectors

6 See particularly K Stevenson, D J Cox & I Channing, eds., *Leading the Police: A History of Chief Constables, 1835 – 2017*, London, Routledge, 2018. Of earlier works, see D S Wall, *The Chief Constables of England and Wales: The socio-legal history of a criminal justice elite*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 1998 and R Reiner, *Chief Constables*, Oxford University Press, 1991.

7 *Leeds Times*, *3 October 1874*

8 *Bradford Weekly Telegraph*, 14 November 1874

9 *Yorkshire Evening Post*, 7 & 8 December 1894 and *Leeds Times*, 8 December 1894. In the 1901 census the once-married Woodman was living alone and working as a housepainter. Woodman was looking after his parents and his brother's family.

10 *Yorkshire Evening Post*, 7 December 1894

11 *Bradford Daily Telegraph*, 11 December 1894, *Bradford Weekly Telegraph*, 11 July 1896 & 16 June 1899. Ross had worked with Robert Peacock, chief constable of Manchester, who established educational classes for the force

and whose addresses were published as *Police Constables' Duties*, Manchester, 1900. Ross, later chief constable of Edinburgh, published his 'lectures and addresses' as *Police Administration*, n.d. [1902?] There were other educational publications published in the 1890s and 1900s and aimed at ordinary constables, such as T Marriott, *A Constable's Duty and how to do it*, London, Reeves & Turner, 1894.

12 The 1861 report referred to basic training 'in simple mobility movements' as being 'hardly sufficient ,,, [for] their being moved with steadiness and decisive effect.'

13 HMIC annual report for 1873

14 HMIC annual report for 1894

15 *Leeds Mercury*, 12 November 1874

16 Individual information drawn from Bradford Constable's Defaulter Book, 1870 – 98 and Constable's Disciplinary Report Book, 1870 – 98 provided by West Yorkshire Archive Service and accessed via Ancestry.

17 *Bradford Daily Telegraph*, 6 July 1895

18 *Bradford Daily Telegraph*, 27 July 1895 and *Leeds Mercury* 29 July 1895

19 The watch committee approved an increase of 36 men to deal with the crowds expected between May and October for the National Exhibition of Works of Art, which was opened by the Prince of Wales on 19 May 1868. It is estimated that in total about 500,000 people visited the exhibition. The exhibition catalogue can be seen at National Exhibition of Works of Art, at Leeds, 1868 : official catalogue : National Exhibition of Works of Art (1868 : Leeds, England) : Free Download, Borrow, and Streaming : Internet Archive

20 For details, see Churchill, 'Crime and Police,' pp.68-70

21 *Leeds Times*, 8 January 1859

22 *Leeds Mercury*, 2 January 1859

23 *Leeds Mercury*, 2 January 1862, *Leeds Times*, 7 December 1862 and *Leeds Intelligencer*, 7 & 14 December 1862. Ironically, English came to Leeds from Norwich as a result of the latter's 'penny wise pound foolish' policy regarding his salary. *Norfolk Chronicle*, 26 February 1859.

24 *Leeds Times*, 4 August 1866. One of the unsuccessful candidates was William Hannan, chief constable of Middlesbrough and later chief constable of Huddersfield.

25 *Leeds Mercury*, 27 October 1874

26 HMIC annual report, 1859. A similar comment about the impact of long-service and physical disability was made in the 1861 report.

27 Woodford was particularly concerned with the night beats, over half of which took an hour and a half and all (64) were over an hour long. HMIC report 1862.

10.5920/policedSociety.8

28 HMIC report 1872 and 1873. Leeds was not alone, 1872 was a difficult year for many boroughs in the northern district.

29 Churchill, 'Crime and Police', p.75

30 Information derived from Constable's and Officer's Conduct Books provided by West Yorkshire Archive Service and accessed via Ancestry,

31 Churchill, 'Crime and Police,' pp.87-8

32 Churchill, 'Crime and Police,' p.78

33 Churchill, *Crime Control*, p.49

34 There were also variations to be found as the force experimented with the most effective structure. In 1890, for example, there was a probationary class plus third, second and first classes. Depending on length of service, there were five pay grades within the first class. In addition, the merit class contained four pay grades.

35 HMIC annual report, 1863

36 *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 24 May 1869

37 *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 2 May 1894

38 This was widely reported in the regional press, see for example *Hull Daily Mail*, 6 October 1898

39 S Harrison, *A Complete History of the Great Flood at Sheffield*, Sheffield 1864, A Complete History of the Great Flood at Sheffield (shu.ac.uk) refers to the Jackson's conduct as 'in the highest degree commendable,' p.81

40 Report … [of] the Examiners [into] Acts of Intimidation, Outrage or Wrong alleged to have been promoted, encouraged or connived at by the Trade Unions in the Town of Sheffield, Report, 1867, p.vii

41 *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 4 June 1859

42 Town council debate on minutes of watch committee reported in *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 14 February 1863

43 Williams, 'Police and Crime,' p.143

44 HMIC annual report, 1865

45 *Sheffield Evening Telegraph*, 13 January 1896 report on town council discussion of watch committee (and police sub-committee) minutes.

46 *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 15 September 1859. Inspectors and sub-inspectors averaged twelve years' service. As he conceded the largest group of men third-class constables averaged little over a year and it was amongst these men that the greatest churn took place.

47 Jackson evidence to Select Committee on Police Superannuation funds, Parl. Papers 1875, 325, Q.1753

48 Figures taken from HMIC annual reports. There was year on year variations. In 1898 the figure fell to 32 per cent and in 1895 it rose to 79 per cent.

10.5920/policedSociety.8

49 Figures taken from Jackson's special report, 1859 and 1871, and annual reports to the watch committee. See particularly report in *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 4 June 1859 and *Sheffield Independent*, 1 March 1871. HMIC annual report 1874 gave a figure of 20 percent but Jackson's evidence to the select committee on police superannuation funds gave a figure of 15 percent.

50 Jackson's address at the annual mayoral dinner for the police, *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 12 October 1870

51 Williams, 'Police and Crime,' p.192

52 *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 3 November 1877 and 27 October 1881

53 *Sheffield Independent*, 27 October 1881. Italics added – the watch committee did not define what constituted 'too much drink!'

54 *Sheffield Evening Telegraph*, 8 January 1891

55 For details see *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 13 April 1865.

56 *Sheffield Daily telegraph*, 8, 9 & 11 May 1867

57 *Sheffield Independent*, 12 March 1874. Similarly in 1877 alderman Grundy, chair of the watch committee, defended not dismissing constables found guilty of being drunk on duty on the grounds that fines were 'sufficiently heavy.' *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 30 October 1877.

58 *Sheffield Independent*, 9 March & 13 April 1899 and *Sheffield Evening Telegraph*, 8 April 1899

59 *Sheffield Evening Telegraph*, 8 April 1899

60 *Sheffield Daily News*, 14 July 1859

61 *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 8 January 1872

62 *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 8 January 1872

63 *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 20 March 1872

64 *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 12 December 1872

65 *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 1 March 1871

66 SC on Police Superannuation Funds, 1875, Q.422 (Elgee 'the men do not stop here [Sheffield] very long'] and Q.1801 [Jackson 'considerable difficulty' in recruitment including 'no recruits from Sheffield.']

67 *Sheffield Evening Telegraph*, 12 September 1891

68 *Sheffield Daily telegraph*, 1 March 1871

69 Chief constable's annual report, *Sheffield Independent*, 9 September 1863. Figures from his 1859 report gave a slightly lower figure of 3.5 percent, *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 13 July 1859

70 *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 11 August 1859

71 *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 14 October 1858

72 *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 14 October 1858

10.5920/policedSociety.8

73 *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 15 July 1880

74 *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 3 March 1883

75 *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 9 January 1890

76 Perversely, there were those that argued that low wages necessitated the recruitment of 'too many by who by birth and training are alien to the English … whose chief credentials consist of a thorough knowledge of bludgeons and life preservers' – an unsubtle prejudice against the Irish.

77 *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 14 March 1872

78 The question of pay was also related to hours of work. The working day and the working week were shrinking across many parts of the economy. Sheffield police were granted an eight-hour day in December 1875 but the watch committee rejected a claim for leave of one day a fortnight, as it did again in 1883. Eventually, in 1896 the watch committee increased annual leave by seven days, bringing Sheffield up to the average of twenty-one days' leave for constables in city forces. *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 9 March 1896

79 *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 14 October 1858

80 *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 11 August 1859

81 *Sheffield Independent*. 30 October 1869

82 *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 25 October 1864 for the 'abomination' quote and, as an example, the debate over awarding an allowance to the widow of a man who had only served five years, *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 30 October 1862.

83 Select Committee on Police Superannuation Funds, PP 1875, QQ. 1779 & 1787

84 Select Committee on Police Superannuation Funds, PP 1875, Q.1787

85 *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*. 1 & 8 May 1875

86 Select Committee on Police Superannuation Funds, PP 1875, QQ. 4375-6 & 4378-9

87 Select Committee on Police Superannuation Funds, PP 1875, xiii, p.553

88 Select Committee on Police Superannuation Funds, PP 1875, QQ.4251 & 4289. Unsurprisingly, PC Kershaw, Leeds, gave similar evidence, for example Q.4457

89 *Sheffield Evening Telegraph*, 7 April 1888

90 See for example, Henry Riches, the newly-appointed chief constable of Middlesbrough. D Taylor, *Policing the Victorian Town: The development of the police in Middlesbrough c.1840 – 1914*, Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2002, p.114

10.5920/policedSociety.8