

## Denouncing Wadworth's Beer 1889

### Pewsey Petty Sessions



The usual monthly petty sessions were held at the Police court on Friday before the Rev J H Gale (in the chair), the Hon and Rev B P Bouverie, Rev W H Awdry and C W Curtis, esq., W H Fowle, esq., and A R E Hussey Freke, esq.

John Mace, landlord of the Bell beerhouse, Pewsey, was charged with permitting drunkenness on his licenced premises on the 12<sup>th</sup> October.

Inspector Carter said that a man named William Cook was on the defendant's premises about nine o'clock on the date mentioned. He was not then drunk. He saw him come out of the house subsequently about ten o'clock. He was very drunk and created a disturbance. Cook was afterwards fined at Everley Petty Sessions for being drunk.

William Cook, called to give evidence, said that he had only paid for one glass of beer; he was not drunk and had had very little drink at the Bell. Defendant denied that Cook had got drunk on his premises. He (defendant) had to work for his living at Axford.

The beerhouse was not worth a farthing. To depend on it meant starvation and as for Wadworth's beer making people drunk, they would burst before they got drunk on it. (laughter). It was not strong enough to make anyone drunk. The man Cook stayed only a few minutes in his house. That was the truth, and he wished he might die before he left the Court and have to be carried out if it was not.

The Chairman: Don't talk in that foolish way; it is wrong.

Defendant: It is not wrong; I will say it; I beg leave to differ with you; it is not nonsense.

The Chairman: Have you any witnesses?

Defendant then called his wife who corroborated his statement.

Harriet Cook, mother of William Cook, corroborated her son's statement.

The magistrates having consulted, the Chairman said there was no doubt the man Cook was drunk, but there was not sufficient evidence to show that he got drunk on defendant's premises. Therefore the case against the defendant would be dismissed. It was clear that the police had had to caution defendant for disorderliness in connection with the house.

When he took the house defendant was told that whether present or not he would be held responsible for the management of the house. He must caution defendant that if he was at any time found guilty of a breach of the law the penalty would be very severe.

Defendant (impudently): Who's to pay my costs?

The Chairman: We allow no costs.

Defendant: I want my expenses.

The Chairman: Go away - (to the superintendent) - Remove him.

Devizes & Wiltshire Gazette Thursday 14 November 1889