

THE PUB AND THE IRISH NATION

Bradley Kadel

Historians of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Ireland have by and large given little attention to the position of publicans within the popular culture surrounding nationalist politics. This gap in the historiography is unfortunate since, as my research has shown, the publican has played no small role in the politics of Irish nationalism. Vintners and their trade association in Dublin wielded profound political influence at the turn of the twentieth century; such power was used to fight against increased efforts by city magistrates to police their barrooms and to shape the popular culture surrounding drink. Increasingly through the 1870s and 1880s, the Irish drink trade cast the liquor laws passed by the imperial Parliament as coercive legislation designed to subjugate the Irish to English laws and traditions. While the legislative ambitions of the temperance movement grew in the 1860s and 1870s, the vintner trade attacked the legislation as essentially racist in purpose. The Irish-American Civil War veteran and nationalist historian, D.P. Conyngham, vehemently decried the policies emanating from Westminster, claiming that “One object was kept steadily in view – to render life in Ireland intolerable to Catholics, or, failing their absolute expulsion, to degrade them to the level of brutes.”¹ Irish publicans and their allies in the 1870s and 1880s would hone a similar message of the victimizing of Ireland by way of the colonial liquor laws that governed the nation.

Like most nineteenth-century Irish nationalists, many scholars have resisted contributing to the international image of the intemperate Irish. Yet it is important that scholars understand

the origins of “drunken Paddy” as well as the role of alcohol and the retail drink trade in Irish history. Despite the popularity of pub patronage and its highly visible place in Irish popular culture, historians only recently have begun to explore the role of the pub in cultural, social, and political history. The most recent contribution in this field has been Kevin Kearns’s noteworthy oral history of the pub in twentieth-century Dublin.² Nonetheless, well documented as it is, this study only begins to scratch the surface of the rich and multifaceted subject of drink in Ireland.

Irish historiography has tended to focus instead on the role of temperance in the so-called “drink question.” Given the almost legendary reputation of Father Mathew’s temperance campaign in the years just prior to the Great Potato Famine, this historiographical development is understandable. Those scholars who have considered the complex relationship of drink and the drink trade to Irish nationalism have tended to focus almost solely on Mathew and his influence on the simultaneous evolution of nationalism and temperance in Ireland. In fact, in the last decade there have been no less than three major studies of Father Mathew and his movement. In a more wide-ranging study, Elizabeth Malcolm has shown how temperance activities, aside from promoting sobriety and temperance legislation, could promote a brand of nationalist politics devoid of moral turpitude. Taking her title from the nineteenth-century Irish temperance slogan, “Ireland Sober, Ireland Free,” Malcolm explores the political dynamics of the merging of nationalist ideology with temperance rhetoric.³ At the same time, this slogan reflected the familiar late nineteenth-century view that national independence could only emerge once the native populations matured to an acceptable degree. George Bretherton’s contribution to the historical understanding of Irish nationalism and temperance documents the crucial links between Father Mathew’s temperance campaign and the Repeal Movement of the late 1840s.⁴ As these authors have in part demonstrated, the temperance movement, which included a variety of groups with an array of beliefs and a diverse

membership, had much to gain from embracing the increasingly potent politics of Irish patriotism. Conversely, nationalists could gain much political capital by embracing temperance, whether superficially or actively. This political reality was not lost on those within the retail drink trade in Ireland in the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

Like Irish nationalists - whose links to temperance movements have been so well documented - publicans and licensed grocers comprehended that the growing links between insobriety, lawlessness, and the Irish character diminished the legitimacy of calls for nationhood and stigmatized the Irish trade as particularly threatening. For the drink trade, negative perceptions of Catholic Ireland threatened the prospect of independence, and depictions of the “native” Irish as a drunken and criminal race undermined the respectability and profitability of public house habituation. Publicans, like temperance reformers, often attacked the drunkenness associated with beerhouses and shebeens, as well as fairs, wakes, nationalist rallies, and holidays in which drinking took place outside the officially sanctioned public house. For those involved in the liquor trade, for the many urban artisans who attended anti-temperance rallies, and for the many more who frequented public houses, resisting the temperance lobby was about fighting for an increasingly self-regulated, modern, and - as Irish publicans saw it - uniquely Irish conception of the public house. Thus, the pro-drink movement sought to defend the liquor trade from serious legislative restriction and thereby maintain its venerable economic and social status by appealing to the Irishman’s right to legitimate recreation, at any respectable hour or on any holiday, within the walls of the well-conducted licensed house.

Public houses have a long history of acting as incubators for revolutionary movements in and outside of Ireland. The British government, reacting to an assertive Irish nationalism, frequently moved to close pubs associated with treasonous activities. In Dublin during the Fenian movement of the 1860s, several pubs

known for offering sanctuary to seditious groups became targets of magistrates and police concerned with eradicating the networks of Fenian agitators. Public houses operated as the primary recruiting ground for Fenians, both inside the larger cities and in the countryside. As R.V. Comerford has written, “public house conviviality was at the very heart of the fabric of Fenianism.”⁵ Beyond simply providing spaces for clandestine meetings of Fenians, pubs operated as public theaters for nationalist displays of defiance. On St. Patrick’s Day in 1867, for example, O’Donovan Rossa met with a group of Fenians at Judes on 13 Grafton Street, an event that acquired notoriety in nationalist histories of Fenianism.⁶ Further asserting their position in the movement, publicans who displayed nationalist banners and flags or harbored Fenian “conspirators” drew the attention of the constabulary, who often opposed the renewal of these licenses at licensing sessions. It is important to note, however, that the Dublin-based Licensed Grocers and Vintners’ Protection Association (LGVPA) made few efforts at this time to defend those traders who endangered their licenses through such behavior.⁷ Answering a Parliamentary inquiry into habitual drunkenness in 1870, the police of County Meath reported that “public houses” were “much frequented by the disaffected for the unlawful purpose of Fenianism and Ribbonism, the low public houses being the places where these combinations are principally carried out.” The authorities recommended “it would be very beneficial to society at large if a great many of those public houses were suppressed.”⁸ Unlike sports gatherings that offered effective cover for Fenian agitation and planning, public houses were more noticeably linked to the threat of revolt by the authorities.⁹ Charging inexpensive prices for intoxicants, so-called “low public houses” became associated with luring otherwise law-abiding citizens into circles of criminality.

More research is necessary to dissect the ways in which pubs served as recruiting grounds for Fenianism, but it is clear from the discourse surrounding the licensing laws in Ireland that heightened intervention into the public house business, both by

curtailing hours of operation and increasing surveillance inside the pubs, was intended to curtail nationalist agitation. During the unrest of the 1860s the authorities intensified their scrutiny of public houses. In 1864, because of the Fenian threat, police started patrolling pubs in pairs instead of walking their beats in solitude, increasing their strength and ability to intimidate and control crowds in pubs and other public spaces. From 1864 until 1867, arrests for drunkenness fell precipitously, which police and temperance reformers credited to the more visible police presence within the pubs. Richard Corr, superintendent of the Dublin Metropolitan Police, admitted before Parliament that the police, throughout the Fenian agitation, kept under surveillance those houses in Dublin suspected of Fenian recruitment.¹⁰ The most efficient means of controlling the growth of Fenianism, it was thought, was by monitoring the barroom.

Although the constabulary's policy of intense supervision of suspicious public houses certainly interfered with the pub business and diminished the likelihood of license renewal, the LGVPA made few objections to the more stringent surveillance during the turbulent 1860s. In fact, no mention of the matter appears in reports of its weekly meetings throughout this period. Instead, the Dublin-based LGVPA, beyond mustering funds to spearhead legislative opposition to the first of the Sunday Closing and Permissive bills, concerned itself primarily with demonizing beerhouses, shebeens, and other retailers of drink outside its organization. In this way, it attempted to maintain the trade's "respectable" character in the face of temperance reformers' harsh accusations of moral depravity and lack of loyalty. Indeed, the head of the LGVPA, Michael Carey, claimed before Parliament that the new nationalist sentiment in the country, far from engendering drunkenness and immorality, had had a positive impact upon the habits of the people.¹¹ Speaking before the same Parliamentary committee on Sunday Closing, C. De Gernon, a Tipperary magistrate, pointed to the inclination among the working classes to spend their leisure time on Sundays engaged in

reading aloud newspapers and debating politics, not just in public houses, but on their “doorsteps in their own private homes.”¹² According to such perspectives The popular interest in “Irish” matters tended to uplift the people by drawing them away from frivolous pursuits and drunken debasement.

As the temperance movement mobilized in the late 1860s and 1870s to pass permissive and Sunday closing legislation, the drink trade and its allies, recognizing the threat of a morally strident Irish nationalism, struck back with its own patriotic message. If, as R.V. Comerford has argued, the popularity of Fenianism can be linked to a “modest prosperity” and new forms of recreation in the 1860s, then economic depression in the 1870s and the prospect of losing what small progress had been gained served to harden attitudes among assistants and small employers towards the economic mismanagement of the country. This nationalist perspective found voice in Cornelius Dennehy, a Dublin trader and outspoken critic of British rule, who represented the more advanced nationalist wing of the association. In addressing the monthly meeting of the LGVPA in Dublin, he publicly denounced the attempts by temperance organizations to prove the degree of inebriety in Ireland: “The semi-pagan population of England committed crimes unknown in Ireland without the incentive of drunkenness at all . . . and it was absurd to try to prove by statistics from Great Britain that this country was in a state of semi-barbarism.”¹³ At the next month’s meeting of the Association, Dennehy continued his series of direct nationalist attacks upon the temperance movement and the Permissive Bill Association as it existed in Ireland. As with most matters of the new nativist-minded cultural nationalism, it was the English origins of the temperance legislation that made it most suspect:

They all knew that for a long time in England a great association had existed, with vast funds at its disposal, for the total suppression of the trade in intoxicating drinks. When that organization was introduced into Ireland, it

came with a new name – that of the Irish Permissive Bill Association. What did that word “permissive” mean? It meant repression and coercion when applied to this country . . . It was not by these means that the great and good men who had passed away sought to promote the cause of temperance amongst the Irish people. It was by appealing to their feelings and their generous instincts that the people had been taught to be temperate and not by threats of coercion.¹⁴

Vintners like Dennehy sought to establish a fundamental difference between “the great and good men who had passed away,” referring to Father Mathew’s generation of temperance reformers of the pre-Famine decade, and the temperance movement of the 1870s. Whereas Father Mathew’s campaign appealed to virtue and originated within Ireland, the new temperance movement had its roots in England and sought to enforce sobriety only through heavy-handed legislation.

Publicans increasingly recognized in the 1870s that construing permissive and Sunday Closing legislation as penal laws offered the opportunity for harnessing – if not inflaming – popular resistance to temperance. Garrett Barry, the president of the Licensed Grocers and Vintners’ Association of Cork, stressed this point before parliament in April 1868 when he said that “the more penal you make the law, the more likely it is to be violated and not availed of.” Going further, Barry explained that “traders look upon laws, with regard to the sale of beer and spirits in Ireland, as penal laws, and anything to make them more penal will certainly excite a desire to evade them.”¹⁵ With the growth of the nationalist press the LGVPA frequently ventilated such appeals in the increasingly nationalist Irish press according to a tradition of Irish historical resentment of English rule and self-interested justice.

In a similar vein, Dublin vintners claimed that temperance legislation only appeared popular because of the vast sums of English money lavished on the comparatively small temperance

groups in Ireland. According to these public pronouncements by vintners, it was the English economic juggernaut that paid “agents” to organize rallies, saturate the press with alarmist stories of the immorality of Ireland, and circulate deceptive petitions in support of Sunday closing and permissive legislation.¹⁶ As with the land question, it was the powerful English economic order that paid agents to extract a heavy toll on Ireland. According to the Dublin vintners’ calculations, which are most likely exaggerated; the Permissive Bill Association had spent between £18,000 and £19,000 in Ireland in nearly ten years since its beginnings there in 1862. Considering such sums of money, the vociferous Dublin publican and Town Counselor, Mr. Cornelius Dennehy, surmised, “it was evident that the work done was not volunteer work, or spontaneous work, considering that it was accomplished at such a vast expenditure.”¹⁷ Unlike other social reform movements which sought volunteers and charitable contributions from the Irish middle class, the Dublin trade painted temperance reformers as English outsiders or as their Irish agents whose work had the effect of bringing “Ireland into the category of crime, in order that there might be some extenuation of the debasing state of things that existed in their own country.”¹⁸

The socially prominent leadership of the LGVPA drew special attention to the denial of the rights of property inherent in temperance legislation. It was again Cornelius Dennehy of the LGVPA, whose nationalist diatribes were a trade fixture of the Dublin daily press in the 1870s, who couched his denunciation of temperance in terms of various other historic injustices perpetrated upon Ireland: “He [Dennehy] remembered the reform corn law agitations, and he did not remember when there was a more powerful party organized for the carrying out of any measure than the party whose efforts were now concentrated for the purpose of depriving them of their property.” Dennehy’s objections stressed a middle-class ideology of fairness that emphasized the enormity of large capitalist interests at odds with

a nation like Ireland where wealth was primarily in the hands of small farmers and traders. Dennehy continued his jeremiad to the LGVPA by appealing to the publicans' vulnerable position in the face of such large economic interests: "This was not an abstract question – it was one involving the best rights of property, and some of the ablest speakers in the United Kingdom were arrayed against them, and they had also against them the facile pens of the newspaper writers."¹⁹ With the public press at its disposal, the well-funded temperance campaign prompted publicans to counter with their own public message that depicted the liquor trade as engaged in a desperate struggle against damaging legislation that would undermine property rights and Irish economic interests on numerous levels.

Publicans like Dennehy asserted that the imposition of the temperance agenda in Ireland was part of a larger imperial project of militant economic domination on the part of England. By equating Britain's gunboat diplomacy under the banner of free trade with the forceful exporting of permissive legislation for the sake of economic efficiency, Irish publicans characterized temperance, like the English economic juggernaut that benefited industrialists from the North of England, as founded upon imperial self-interest. Again it was Dennehy who put the matter in the most blatant and politically inflammatory terms when he rhetorically asked the question, "What were the principles of free trade originated in the Manchester School, and how were these theories manifested throughout the world?" In reply, he answered that "they were promulgated in China and Japan at the point of the bayonet and the mouth of the canon, and they were put forward with bated breath before the Emperor of the French." Dennehy continued with a common linguistic sleight of hand, arguing that temperance legislation was anything but permissive: "In seeking to promote the permissive principle, as it was called, they had the usual amount of selfishness in view. They imagined that depriving the working man throughout the empire

of what was absolutely required to sustain him in his physical exertions there might be a larger fund created to be expended on the various productions which emanated from Manchester.” The motive behind prohibiting the traffic in liquors, according to Dennehy’s argument, was the economic subjugation of Ireland by means of reducing everyday expenditures upon Irish goods, and thereby maximizing the amount of Irish money spent on English manufactures.

As the debate over Sunday closing intensified in the mid-1870s, Dennehy’s portraiture of temperance grew to dominate the vintner response to legislative action. After the passage of a limited Sunday Closing Bill, which exempted the five largest cities in Ireland, the liquor trade and its allies reacted quickly to denounce the legislation as partisan – akin to past defeats of Irish interests. In a letter sent from London to the trade association in Dublin by P.J. Smythe, the nationalist M.P. from West Meath and stalwart ally of the trade, the nature and likely effect of the legislation was clear. Smythe described the triumph of Sunday closing in terms that implied a need for resistance against an altogether unworkable legal system:

It is coercion, for it is a violent interference with the exercise of a natural right, except in a few instances it has not been abused to the detriment of the community at large. It is one law for the rich and one for the poor, for it leaves to one the club of which it deprives the other. It is legislative robbery as regards the trade, and legislative intolerance as regard the people. It has the form of law, but every element of true law is wanting in it. Its capacity for mischief will be in proportion to the extent to which it is allowed to operate.²⁰

This interpretation of the bill typified the LGVPA’s stance towards Sunday Closing for the next generation. More important for

nationalist publicans, the bill underscored the need for a native legislature to guard against laws which robbed small businessmen of their profits, tampered with the rights of the Irish working classes, and encouraged clandestine habits of drunkenness.

Publicans were at the center of the emerging Catholic middle class that pragmatically joined the nationalist movement after Parnell's succession to leadership. Whereas the LGVPA in the 1860s had been reluctant to ally itself too closely with Irish nationalist politics for fear of being linked with Fenianism and scandal, by the early 1880s the organized licensed trade strengthened its links with the Irish Home Rule Movement and its representatives in Parliament. On 28 March 1885, seeking support from the freshly anointed Home Rule leader, Charles Stewart Parnell, the LGVPA sent a deputation to Westminster to counter freshly drafted temperance legislation.²¹ In the context of the Home Rule movement in the mid-1880s, the deputation saw a new and more advantageous reason for invoking the uniqueness of the Irish case. With the movement in Ireland mobilized behind Parnell and his party, a public statement of support for Irish vintners, it was hoped, would be significant, because it would lessen, if not neutralize, the temperance movement's links with Irish nationalism. In the words of the LGVPA secretary, the deputation met with Parnell to protest against the vintners' "means of livelihood endangered, an extra burden placed on the police, and the rights of the Irish working man tampered with." Premised as they were upon these three key issues – economic justice, fair policing, and natural rights – the LGVPA's political machine disseminated an increasingly nuanced anti-English message to both its members and the public at large. Indeed, vintners' politics had made a crucial turn: from this point on, nearly all reactions to temperance politics originating from the LGVPA in Dublin would be positioned as a form of nationalist resistance to a foreign presence on Irish soil.

The vintners' protests at this time were not altogether new. Such basic vintner themes had a history in the drink trade at least as far back as the early 1860s. But in the 1880s vintners based such ideas upon the identification of the temperance campaign as an inherently anti-Irish political agenda that was complicit with the imperial government in London in suppressing Irish traditions and customary laws. The vintner representatives sent to London wasted no time putting their case in historical terms, complaining that such new temperance legislation represented one more example of English "social experimentation" at the expense of the Irish. The secretary's account of the meeting put it this way:

It was manifestly unfair that an English majority should assail their interests, just at a time when a native legislator was about to be given to our country. English legislators had been continually experimenting on this country in matters of this kind, but the present was not the moment for such experiments, nor was the present English House of Commons constituted in such a matter as to treat the subject impartially. Therefore, they asked Mr. Parnell, as a leader of the great Irish parliamentary party, to express his opinions as to whether such matters should not be relegated to an Irish legislature. He said he believed all such legislation should be dealt with in an Irish parliament, and took occasion to complement the trade on their self-denial and patriotic action.²²

In a speech before Parliament on 2 April 1885, Parnell validated the vintners' petition, declaring that Ireland should exercise control over all such internal matters as that of the drink trade. This speech had the intended effect, in the view of the licensed trade at least, of tying together the national and liquor questions. Keeping vigil over the moves of the Irish temperance lobby, drink sellers attempted to stall all legislation affecting liquor retail until

the national question could be solved. For the next thirty years, Irish vintners would cite this speech when countering temperance legislation for Ireland, contending that only Ireland could justly legislate over such “Irish” matters.

Not coincidentally, the increasingly sophisticated LGVPA organizational network began to distribute to its members information that conflated the issues of Irish nationalism and opposition to virtually all temperance legislation. In 1886, one year after Parnell’s pronouncement on the drink issue, the licensed trade in Dublin sent a circular to all association members, assuring subscribers that “the result of this [Parnell’s] declaration at the present time, when restrictive legislation can be rushed through with such facility, we look on as most important for it amounts to a protest on the part of Mr. Parnell against any attempt at tampering with our Irish liquor laws in the imperial House of Commons.”²³ Circulars of this sort appear to have been distributed to all LGVPA members with increased frequency. Such unabashed support for Parnell’s leadership – and for the economic benefits to be garnered from his position – no doubt helped shore up popular support among an economically and geographically splintered class of Irish vintners for Parnell and his nationalist followers in Parliament. The inner circle of the licensed trade in Dublin seems to have been in full agreement “that as long as Mr. Parnell was at the head of affairs in Ireland, no class would be unfairly treated.”²⁴

The political optimism of the association emphasized national unity, contending that the rights of both tenants in the countryside and the working classes in the cities would be most infringed upon if the House of Commons took any action on the “drink question.” The LGVPA sought to popularize the cause by vouching for the good character of nationalist publicans and the inherent dignity in the Irish tradition of public-house patronage. The dialogue that Dublin publicans initiated with vintners throughout Ireland helped sustain, if not promote, a

national identity throughout all counties outside Ulster. It is, furthermore, clear that by the 1880s, the licensed trade had at least partly succeeded in wresting back from the temperance campaign the mantle of Irish nationalism. The new patriotic language of the LGVPA suggested the degree to which the Land League and Home Rule Movement had by the 1880s captured support within the largely middle-class bureaucracy of the vintners' trade association in Dublin. Before Home Rule, the LGVPA leadership had rarely lobbied the state on matters other than its own direct economic interest, but by the 1880s, the burgeoning of popular politics in the form of Home Rule and the Land League offered new opportunities for organizational growth.

Indeed, the strategy of the LGVPA seemed to pay off. The 1890s was a decade of continued trade consolidation, within Ireland as well as throughout the United Kingdom. Although the temperance element within Irish nationalism would persist well beyond the founding of the Free State, the LGVPA, in embracing Parnellism and protecting nationalist publicans from losing their licenses for political reasons, had at least cast some doubt upon the validity of the motto, "Ireland Sober, Ireland Free." The LGVPA widely publicized its contention that it was regulation of the drink trade that would have to wait. Restriction of the Irish drink trade, according to the LGVPA and its allies, represented a matter of such domestic import that the imperial Parliament was ill suited to resolve the matter. Given the overwhelming popularity of public house patronage and the power and influence of the nationalist LGVPA, no comprehensive study of Irish nationalism can afford to exclude the politics of the public house. Adding vintner voices to the growing body of work on Irish nationalism will serve as a corrective to the focus heretofore given to temperance and nationalism in Irish historiography. Moreover, what is needed is a more dynamic approach to the "drink question" that considers this complex subject in dialectical terms. For a wide spectrum of Irish society, the public house stood at the center of Irish nationalist identity, whether as one who wore the badge of total

abstinence and therefore sought the pub's removal from center-stage, or as one reveled in the daily conviviality of the snug and toasted its continued health and prosperity.

University of Wisconsin, Madison

bkadel@education.wisc.edu

NOTES

This article is adapted from a chapter on nationalist politics and the Irish drink trade in my dissertation, "The Politics of Drink in Ireland, 1861-1918" (University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2004).

1. D.P. Conyngham, *Ireland Past and Present* (New York: James Sheehy Publishers, 1884), 207.
2. Kevin C. Kearns, *Dublin Pub Life and Lore: An Oral History* (New York: Roberts Reinhart, 1997).
3. Elizabeth Malcolm, *Ireland Sober, Ireland Free* (Dublin: Gill and McMillan, 1986).
4. George Bretherton, "The Battle Between Carnival and Lent: Temperance and Repeal in Ireland, 1829-1845," *Social History* 27 (November 1994): 295-320.
5. R.V. Comerford, "Patriotism as Pastime: The Appeal of Fenianism in the mid 1860s," *Irish Historical Studies* 22 (1981): 247.
6. I found reference to this meeting in the "Bouch Diary: Notes on Old Irish Taverns and Inns and Latter Day Public Houses," compiled on 2 January 1942 and included in the manuscript collection [MS16298] at the National Library of Ireland.
7. The LGVPA represented a powerful political coalition of Dublin publicans in the nineteenth century. Founded in 1819, the association's roots can be traced to the Cooks and Vintners Guild of Dublin.
8. Return Relating to Habitual Drunkenness, H.C., vol. XVIII, (1871): 227.
9. Comerford, "Patriotism as Pastime: The Appeal of Fenianism in the mid 1860s," 247.

10. Minutes of evidence taken before the select committee on sale of liquors on Sunday (Ireland) bill, H.C., vol. XIV, (1867-1868, 28 April 1868): 81.
11. *Ibid.*, 76.
12. *Ibid.*, 8.
13. News clipping taken from Evening Post, undated, (located in “Minute book” of Licensed Grocers and Vintners’ Protection Association, 11 June 1871; Headquarters of the Licensed Vintners Association, Balls Bridge, Dublin).
14. News clipping taken from Freeman’s Journal, undated, (“Minute book” of Licensed Grocers and Vintners’ Association, 1 July 1871).
15. Minutes of evidence taken before the select committee on sale of liquors on Sunday bill, H.C., vol. XIV, (1867-1868, 28 April 1868), 89.
16. News clipping entitled “New Licensing Bill,” *Freeman’s Journal*, (“Minute book” of the Licensed Grocers and Vintners’ Assistants’ Association, 12 March 1871; Mandate Trade Union, Parnell Sq., Dublin).
17. *Ibid.*
18. *Ibid.*
19. News clipping from Evening Post, undated, (LVA, LVGPA Minutes, November 6, 1871).
20. Letter from P.J. Smythe, M.P., (“Minute book” of Licensed Grocers and Vintners’ Association, 28 Aug. 1878).
21. Secretary’s minutes, (“Minute book” of Licensed Grocers and Vintners’ Association, 4 April 1885).
22. *Ibid.*
23. Secretary’s minutes (“Minute book” of Licensed Grocers and Vintners’ Association, 15 May 1886).
24. Secretary’s minutes (“Minute book” of Licensed Grocers and Vintners’ Association, 18 June 1886).