

Gladstone and Liverpool:

MP for South Lancashire, 1865–68

At a crucial stage in his career, Gladstone represented the area of his birth. *David Nolan* links Liverpool's reaction to electoral reform and Gladstone's popularity.

Walter Bagehot, the mid-nineteenth century journalist and constitutional expert, once wrote of Gladstone: 'Ah, Oxford on the surface, but Liverpool below.'¹ William Ewart Gladstone was born at 62 Rodney Street in Liverpool, on 29 December 1809. The family soon moved five miles north to an estate at Seaforth (long-since swallowed up by the expansion of Liverpool's urban hinterland) where the future Liberal Prime Minister spent his early years, before being sent to Eton in 1821. Thereafter, his links with the town of his birth were not strong, even if, as is sometimes suggested, he retained traces of a Liverpool accent. In 1830 his father moved to Fasque, between Dundee and Aberdeen, and subsequently William's brother Robertson was the only one who made his home in Liverpool.

However, the town did play a significant part in his political career between 1865 and 1868, when he was MP for the South Lancashire county division, of which Liverpool was one of the principal centres. By looking at how Liverpudlians responded to him, his election campaigns, and the issues which he promoted, we gain an impression of how this giant of the Victorian era was perceived by some of his contemporaries far-removed from the closed-world of the 'Westminster village'.

By the time of the 1865 general election Gladstone, one-time Tory minister and opponent of the 1832 Reform Bill, had served for six years as Chancellor of the Exchequer in what is generally regarded as the first Liberal Government, and was rapidly gaining a repu-

tation for radicalism. This apparent shift in his political views was not well received in his staunchly Conservative Oxford University constituency, where he was consequently defeated.

Fortunately the Liberals of South Lancashire, and in particular the party's leaders in Liverpool, had ensured that he was also nominated for his native county. They had done so partly because he was a significant figure, but they also wanted Gladstone as their candidate because of his beliefs. The Liverpool-based periodical *The Porcupine* said that as he had changed from a Tory to 'an enlightened Liberal', Oxford University was no longer the right constituency for him. He should come to Lancashire, for as it had progressed so had he. This journal seems to have understood better than many the idiosyncratic nature of Gladstone's liberalism. It was not under any illusion that he had become an outright radical. Instead, it recognised that he was a moderate reformer who sought 'to reconcile progress with order'. Moreover, he was uniquely placed to deliver moderate reform because of the respect he had from even 'the most extreme of Radicals' who 'will listen to words of moderation and restraint from him which they would heed from no other official lips'.²

He was only confirmed as a candidate for the county after his defeat at Oxford had become clear, and did not begin campaigning until the evening of Tuesday 18 July, when he addressed a meeting at the Liverpool Amphitheatre. Even though this event had only been announced that morning, 35,000 applications for tickets had been received,³ reinforced by the large crowds which surrounded the theatre in the hope of catching a glimpse of him. He told this meeting that he had 'never

swerved' from 'those truly Conservative objects and desires' with which he had begun life, but that experience had taught him 'that there is wisdom in a policy of trust, and folly in a policy of mistrust', and that he had 'not refused to acknowledge and accept the signs of the times'.⁴

Nevertheless, however much he tried to clarify his position, it was the radical elements of his speech which drew most attention. Indeed, people were so convinced of his radicalism that they would even find evidence in what he failed to say. As a correspondent of the pro-Conservative *Courier* pointed out, it was surprising that he made no mention of parliamentary reform, given that he had welcomed his move to South Lancashire as an opportunity to campaign 'unmuzzled'. The writer took this silence as 'ominous'. He believed Gladstone would soon show 'his true extreme Radical colours' but that for the time being he was trying to avoid terrifying the electorate for fear of losing another election.⁵

In the event, the first two seats were taken by Conservatives, with Gladstone being elected in third place. As the *Courier* emphasised, this suggested that South Lancashire was still 'essentially Conservative in its opinions', and that Gladstone had been returned because of who he was, rather than what he believed. Nevertheless, he topped the poll in the Liverpool district, confirming that, for whatever reason, he was popular in the town of his birth and its environs.⁶

There is only fragmentary evidence about how he was regarded by the working class of the town, few of whom would have been able to vote in the county election.⁷ The large crowds which welcomed Gladstone on his arrival at the Amphitheatre on 18 July suggest he had

a significant popular following, as does the cry, 'Gladstone's the working man's friend', which came from a member of the audience at an ear-

garded as an advocate of a large extension of the franchise, following his speech on Baines' Reform Bill in May 1864, when he had famously declared that 'every man who is not presumably incapacitated by some consideration of personal unfitness or of political danger, is morally entitled to come within the pale of the constitution'. He only envisaged a relatively small number being fit for enfranchisement, but was misunderstood, as so often, because of his tendency to indulge in emphatic statements. His attempts to clear up the misunderstanding were simply regarded as a recantation forced upon him by his Cabinet colleagues.¹¹ Despite the furore surrounding this speech elsewhere, it generated surprisingly little interest in the Liverpool press, and that which it did prompt, admittedly in the Conservative

Courier, was negative. It regarded the speech as a shameless bid for mass support, which had 'hustings' written all over it, although, as we have seen, it does not appear to have been a major factor in his election success in South Lancashire.¹²

The Reform Bill which Gladstone announced on 12 March 1866 was largely his own work, reflecting his personal views. He stressed that it was a moderate reform, pointing out, for example, that a borough rental franchise of £7 had been preferred to £6, since the lower figure would have placed the working class in a clear majority in the borough electorate.¹³ Furthermore, he maintained that the resulting increase in the number of working class voters would merely restore them to the proportion of the electorate they had constituted in 1832 but which had since fallen. Despite this moderation, he made it clear that some extension of the franchise was necessary to recognise the just claim to a say in the nation's affairs of those



lier Liberal rally in the same venue.⁸ On the other hand, a meeting during the election campaign for working men to declare their support for parliamentary reform, had given the impression that they were not much interested in the issue.⁹ Similarly, Gladstone's reforming budgets of the early 1860s do not appear to have aroused much excitement.¹⁰ These reforms and his pronouncements on issues such as the extension of the franchise may have won Gladstone the admiration of the working class elsewhere, but one is led to the conclusion that in Liverpool he was popular with the masses more on account of a general impression that he was on their side, reinforced by his rousing platform oratory.

The 1866 Reform Bill

Reform may not have been the chief concern of the working class in Liverpool, but it soon became the major preoccupation of the new Parliament. Gladstone was widely re-

members of the working class who had done most to improve their education and way of life over recent years.¹⁴

The Liverpool press responded to the Bill as one might have expected. The Conservative *Courier* wondered why reform was being pursued given that there was no public demand for it.¹⁵ However, that paper would hardly have been more positive if the Bill had been the result of an upsurge of public opinion, probably quite the opposite. By contrast the town's Liberal papers were generally happy with the Bill. The *Post* regarded it as 'a good Bill' and was not put off by Gladstone's attempts to cast his proposals in a very moderate light, believing that they would result in the enfranchisement of 'thousands of honest, hard-working, and loyal men'.¹⁶ The *Mercury* and *The Albion*, especially the latter, were more measured, happy with the Bill as far as it went, but disappointed that it did not go further. In particular, they would have liked a simultaneous redistribution of seats.¹⁷

Privately many local Liberals were also disappointed that the Bill did not represent 'a broad and complete measure', as Gladstone was informed by William Rathbone junior, the chairman of his campaign committee in 1865, who kept him informed of the mood in South Lancashire. This disappointment concerned more than the omission of a redistribution scheme.¹⁸ Nevertheless, Liverpool's Liberals invited Gladstone to two events intended to demonstrate their support for the Bill, where he received the same highly enthusiastic welcome as he had during his campaign the previous year. The first was a banquet in his honour at the Philharmonic Hall on Thursday 5 April, organised by the Liverpool section of the South Lancashire Liberal Registration Society, at which he explained that the government was determined to achieve reform and had drawn up a moderate bill as the most likely to be passed.¹⁹ The following day, a public meeting, was held at the Amphitheatre. Gladstone told this audi-

ence that: 'it is to a great extent, in these great assemblies of our countrymen, that the opinions and sentiments are formed, which become ultimately the guides of the public mind and the public policy'²⁰. Thus he demonstrated that he was not averse to harnessing extra-parliamentary agitation in support of a cause he wished to promote. These two engagements in Liverpool are of significance, for although Gladstone gained a reputation for speaking to mass public meetings, he did not do it all that often. He received far more invitations to speak than he accepted.²¹ He was probably a little unsure about placing too much burden on mass pressure, given that he believed the masses should generally be deferential, and as a result, he may well have accepted the invitations from Liverpool because as MP for South Lancashire there would be nothing extraordinary about him addressing large gatherings there.

The Amphitheatre meeting sent a strong signal to Parliament that the people of Liverpool wanted the Reform Bill to be passed. Not that Liverpool's Liberals necessarily saw the Bill in the same light as their party leader. Some of the speeches suggest that there were those who looked upon parliamentary reform as the necessary precursor to radical reforms quite different from anything envisaged by Gladstone. Rathbone believed that a reformed House of Commons would look to Gladstone to lead it in a war upon ignorance and upon the 'ghastly and revolting ... contrast' between the 'misery' of many British people and 'the superabundance, wealth and blessings with which Providence has blessed the upper and middle classes of the community'. This suggests that Rathbone wished to see more of a social role for government than Gladstone. The reforms which Gladstone hoped to see were in the direction of reducing government spending, whereas those envisaged by Rathbone would almost certainly increase it. Differences of emphasis notwithstanding, and in spite of any initial reservations,

a resolution proposing that a petition be sent to Parliament in support of the Bill was unanimously carried at the end of this meeting.²²

The apathy towards reform displayed by the town's working men was still evident. A demonstration on Saturday 7 April for the working class of Liverpool to declare its support for the Reform Bill does not appear to have been well-attended. Furthermore, the platform was dominated by members of the local Liberal elite, like Robertson Gladstone and Jeffery, and according to the *Courier* many of those present were not working men at all, but 'curious clerks' on their way home from the office. However, many of the audience were genuine workers, as were some of the speakers. One of them, George Hardy, said he was happy with the Bill as an instalment, although he personally wanted to see household suffrage. But since only his views are recorded in any detail there is no way of knowing if they were typical.²³

Unfortunately for Gladstone the party in Parliament was also unconvinced. A significant number of Liberal MPs, like the Conservative opposition, did not share his belief that reform would strengthen the constitution. The opponents of reform destroyed the Bill through a series of amendments, whereupon Russell's Government resigned. The defeat and resignation prompted mass protests in many major towns, including London, Birmingham and Manchester, but not Liverpool, a further indication that the Reform Bill had not captured the imagination of its people.

The 1867 Reform Bill

Demonstrations in other towns, not least the so-called Hyde Park riots in July, convinced Lord Derby's new Tory government that reform would have to be tackled. Responding to the government's proposals in February 1867, Gladstone promised that the Liberal opposition would support any scheme which offered the prospect of settling this important

issue.²⁴ This constructive approach was applauded by the Liberal press in Liverpool, which wished to see a Reform Bill passed with the minimum of delay.²⁵ Gladstone also had the backing of radicals in Liverpool, as demonstrated by a meeting, organised by the Liverpool Liberal Association and held at the Theatre Royal on 11 March. Moreover, this support came from all levels of society. The *Mercury* noted with satisfaction the presence at the meeting of 'a sufficiently large number of the working classes', and believed the event also showed that 'the great body of the middle classes' in Liverpool were 'actuated by no exclusive spirit' but were instead in favour of a measure which would 'materially extend the franchise in the boroughs and towns'.²⁶

The Bill which Disraeli finally announced, following a series of abortive attempts and the resignation of three members of the Cabinet, provided for household suffrage with various limitations, including dual votes, and a requirement that voters had been resident in a borough for at least two years.²⁷ The dual votes did not survive long, instead, the main sticking point became the exclusion from the franchise of compound householders, those who paid the poor rate as part of their rent. Gladstone complained that exclusion would create an artificial distinction, with the chance factor of where a man lived counting for more than his suitability for admission to the franchise. Since compounding was the decision of the local vestry, a man had no choice and might consequently be refused the vote, whereas a man of similar standing who lived in a parish with no compounding, perhaps even in the same borough, would get on to the register of electors. Gladstone was concerned that as a result many of 'the most skilled and most instructed of our working men' would continue to be denied the vote, while at the same time many of 'the poorest' and 'least instructed' would be enfranchised.²⁸ He was not in favour of household suffrage, for which he did not be-

lieve there was any great demand, but argued that it was worse to purport to offer household suffrage while in fact proposing something not only limited, but limited in a random and unjust manner.²⁹

Having thoroughly investigated rating law, Gladstone presented a detailed case against the exclusion of compound householders. Unfortunately, his speeches during the Second Reading debate on 25 March, bored the Commons, his own side included.³⁰ It is hardly surprising, therefore, that there were no more meetings in Liverpool to give support to his apparently lonely crusade. It was only when he faced rebellions by Liberal MPs over Coleridge's Instruction and Gladstone's own amendment of 11 April, designed to overcome the compounding problem and introduce some fixed line separating qualified voters from the disenfranchised, that Liverpool again rallied to his support. Rating law was too dry a subject to inspire mass meetings, whereas near-mutiny against a great Liberal statesman, who also happened to be a local man and a local MP, was another matter. The amendments were supported by all three major Liberal papers in Liverpool – the *Mercury*, the *Daily Post*, and *The Albion*.³¹ The *Post* would have liked Gladstone to press for full household suffrage.³² That it still backed his efforts shows that even those in Liverpool who were more radical continued to have faith in him. The *Mercury* accepted that the Bill would have been lost had the 11 April amendment been passed, and for that reason had mixed feelings over it. The paper was relieved that there was still the prospect of a settlement being reached that session, but at the same time agreed with Gladstone that the Bill was still seriously flawed.³³ Fortunately, amendments were eventually won which resulted in a Bill much more to the liking of Gladstone and his Liverpool supporters, even if short of their ideal. The period of residence required of voters was reduced to one year, provision was made for the enfranchisement of lodgers, and

compounding was abolished under Hodgkinson's amendment.³⁴

In the meantime, there had been a strong campaign in Liverpool to persuade Liberal MPs to rally behind their leader. Most notably, a meeting of South-West Lancashire county voters was held at Hengler's Circus in the town on 30 April. Much was said, in praise of Gladstone's stance and in criticism of the government's Bill. A number of speakers, including William Rathbone junior, disagreed with the prevailing view in the Commons that any Reform Bill was preferable to further delay. Rathbone also expressed his belief that Gladstone continued to have the support of the working classes as a result of the benefits his policies had given them. In consequence, he believed, 'they will accept at his hands, in faith in his wisdom and love for them, even limitations of their power as a settlement of this great question'.³⁵ Assuming Rathbone had good grounds for this belief, one might conclude that Gladstone remained popular among the working class of Liverpool during this difficult period. They do not appear to have held meetings of their own to give him their support, but even in 1866 they had not done that.

The 1868 general election

The redistribution of seats in the 1867 Reform Bill caused much less conflict in Parliament. Gladstone's South Lancashire division was split into new South-West and South-East divisions. The Liberal committees in both new divisions were anxious to retain Gladstone as their candidate, but following consultation Brand, the party's chief whip, settled upon the South-West, which included Liverpool.

On paper the Manchester-dominated South-East looked a safer prospect, but that was one reason why it was not chosen, for, as William Rathbone pointed out, it might look as though Gladstone was running

scared from his native part of the county. The bolder course was chosen in the hope of lifting the party's campaign effort nationally.³⁶ It was clear throughout that Gladstone was speaking, not just to the electors of South-West Lancashire, but to the whole nation as leader of a potential government. Consequently, his personal campaign was used to highlight the major issue on which the Liberals were basing their appeal to the country, the disestablishment of the Irish (Anglican) Church.³⁷

Gladstone's campaign got under way in earnest with a demonstration at the Amphitheatre on 14 October. He devoted most of his speech to explaining his policy on the Irish Church. He argued that the establishment of a church to which the majority of the population did not belong had brought about 'the estrangement of the minds of the people from the law, from public authority, from this country ... and ... from the throne'. Disestablishment was necessary in order to 'remove the sense of injustice and oppression in Ireland'. The attempt, which he had earlier supported, to Anglicise Ireland, above all by converting it to Anglican Protestantism, had failed and should be abandoned. This policy was endorsed at this meeting by Thomas Dyson Hornby, the chairman of the South-West Lancashire Liberal Association, and by Henry Grenfell, the other Liberal candidate in the county election. J. H. Macrae questioned why 'the great majority' of Anglican clergy were hostile to the Irish disestablishment policy, and sought to reassure them that they were wrong to see it as a step towards disestablishment in England. He spoke of how Gladstone had been of valuable service to the Church in the past and would one day be recognised as one of its true friends.³⁸ Dissenting views were unlikely to be expressed at an election rally, but the fact that so many speakers publicly expressed their backing for disestablishment, when they could just as easily have concentrated on Gladstone's past achievements and personal qualities, suggests that

the policy did have the backing of leading Liberals in Liverpool. This is hardly surprising given that there was a predominance of nonconformists among the leading figures in the party locally.³⁹

The nonconformists of the area seemed to be solidly behind the Liberal candidates. They welcomed any opportunity to attack the principle of establishment and promote the cause of freedom of conscience, even though it was made plain, as in Macrae's speech, that the Liberal Party had no intention of depriving the Church of England of its established status. Local Liberals were also confident of the support of the Catholic community, for whom Irish disestablishment had an obvious appeal.⁴⁰ This was an uneasy alliance, for the nonconformists had no wish to assist the cause of the Papists; consequently, Gladstone's meetings with local Catholic landlords were kept secret from them.⁴¹ Nevertheless, the Liberals were confident of being able to hold together this disparate support. This was a major boost, as in 1865 the nonconformists had been split between the two parties, and most Catholics had voted Conservative in protest at a Liberal foreign policy which they saw as anti-papal.⁴²

The trouble was that, even united, the Dissenters and Catholics were no match for the local Anglican magnates and clergy, who were determined to defeat Gladstone over Irish disestablishment. They knew that the policy could not be stopped, as it was already clear that a Liberal majority had been returned to Parliament, but sensed that its principal architect was vulnerable because of the strength of popular Protestantism in the area.⁴³ As the *Courier* pointed out, just because a majority in the country had apparently backed Irish disestablishment, that was no reason why the voters of South-West Lancashire should abandon their principles and throw their weight behind it.⁴⁴ The clergy in particular seem to have played an important part in the effort to defeat Gladstone, even managing to

override the influence of the landlord in Kirkby where sixty tenants of the Earl of Sefton were persuaded to vote Conservative by their vicar, even though the Earl was recommending a Liberal vote.⁴⁵

Sefton was the exception to the rule – the only Protestant landowner with significant electoral influence in South-West Lancashire who used it in support of the Liberal side. He seems to have done so more out of respect for his family's long-standing Liberal tradition than out of conviction. He had serious reservations about Gladstone's apparent radicalism, and the policy of Irish disestablishment in particular. Indeed, even Grenfell, who was his kinsman and had been brought in as part of the effort to maintain Sefton's support, was regarded by him as being too advanced.⁴⁶

A majority of the voters in South-West Lancashire seem to have heeded the advice of their Anglican landlords and vicars, for on 24 November they returned Cross and Turner, the two Tory candidates, defeating Gladstone and Grenfell. However, Gladstone did top the poll in the Liverpool polling district, with 401 votes more than Turner and 420 more than Cross, despite that being the part of the county division where the ultra-Protestant Orange Lodge was at its strongest.⁴⁷ This was final proof of his continued popularity in the town, which had been on display throughout the campaign, from the singing in his honour at that first big rally,⁴⁸ through to the thousands who put up with miserable November weather to hear him speak at the official nomination on the Saturday before polling.⁴⁹ One particularly revealing event, described in press reports as a working men's meeting, took place at Hengler's Circus on 27 October. It expressed support both for Gladstone and for the policy of Irish disestablishment, with only a few dissenting votes.⁵⁰ The defeat of both Liberal candidates in the Liverpool borough election casts doubt on the strength of support for this policy in the town. Nevertheless, one could speculate that it might

have been endorsed in the borough election had Gladstone been standing there rather than for the county. For unless the Hengler's Circus meeting was almost exclusively attended by Catholic or Dissenting workers – which admittedly is possible – what it reveals is that workers, regardless of creed, continued to regard Gladstone as a radical who had their best interests at heart. Mr Priest, a watchmaker, declared 'his general policy is such as to merit the enthusiastic and uncompromising support of the working classes of this country'. Similarly, a printer, Mr Hynes, spoke of him as one of 'those men who had supported great measures for the benefit of the masses' – the others, incidentally, being Bright and Mill.⁵¹ Priest and Hynes were skilled workers, so their views may not be typical of the bulk of manual labourers, though they do sound as though they were stating what they believed to be the general opinion of 'the masses'.

Conclusion

Gladstone was a popular figure in his native Liverpool, and this remained the case in 1868 even though he failed to be returned for the county, and even though his party was defeated in the contest for the town's representation. Across the social spectrum, he was admired on account of his high-profile persona, his sense of conviction, and his reforming zeal – even by those whose views were very different.

In Liverpool, as elsewhere, he was thought far more radical than he actually was. Few grasped that he saw the purpose of reform as essentially conservative – although to be fair, his politics were such a complex and unique blend of conservatism and liberalism it is hardly surprising he was misunderstood.

It would appear that he was capable of leading opinion in Liverpool in a way which many other Liberals, who lived and worked in the town, generally failed to do. He rallied the town behind his 1866

Reform Bill, but once he had returned to London others do not seem to have been able to maintain the momentum; thus, while other towns protested at the Bill's demise Liverpool remained quiet. Furthermore, he managed to top the poll in the Liverpool district of the South and South-West Lancashire constituencies in both 1865 and 1868, in spite of his plan for Irish disestablishment – no inconsiderable achievement in a city ridden by sectarianism well into the twentieth century.

Arguably, his Lancashire campaigns of the 1860s showed Gladstone doing what he was best at – taking his message to the people and winning them over, if not by his arguments, then by his passionate and stirring oratory. He was never again to campaign as a candidate in his native county, but the skills he developed there were to be exploited once more, in Midlothian, eleven years later.

David Nolan is Secretary of Crosby Liberal Democrats. This article is based on his recently completed MA dissertation, Liverpoolian Responses to Gladstone and Gladstonian Liberalism c1859–1868.

Notes

- 1 Quoted in R. Jenkins, *Gladstone*, (Macmillan, London, 1995), p. 3.
- 2 *The Porcupine*, Vol. VII (1865), p. 105.
- 3 *Liverpool Mercury*, 19 July 1865, p. 6.
- 4 W. E. Gladstone, *Speeches and Addresses Delivered at the Election of 1865* (John Murray, London, 1865), p. 19.
- 5 *Daily Courier*, 20 July 1865, p. 6.
- 6 *Daily Post*, Supplement, 21 July 1865, p. 2.
- 7 The poll book does not survive, making it impossible to say precisely who voted for him.
- 8 *Post*, 12 July 1865, p. 4.
- 9 *Post*, Supplement, 11 July 1865, p. 2.
- 10 For example, they did not send a petition in protest at the Lords' rejection of his repeal of Paper Duties.
- 11 *Courier*, 20 July 1865, p. 6.
- 12 *Courier*, 12 May 1864, p. 4.
- 13 F. B. Smith, *The Making of the Second Reform Bill* (Cambridge, 1966), p. 52.
- 14 *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*, third series, vol. 182 (1866), pp. 38–39.
- 15 *Courier*, 14 March 1867, p. 6.

- 16 *Post*, Supplement, 14 March 1866, p. 1.
- 17 *Albion*, 19 March 1866, p. 4; *Mercury*, 14 March 1867, p. 6.
- 18 E. F. Rathbone, *William Rathbone: A Memoir* (Macmillan, London, 1905), pp. 206–209.
- 19 *Mercury*, 6 April 1866, p. 6.
- 20 H. C. G. Matthew, *Gladstone 1809–1874*, (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1986), p. 134.
- 21 *Ibid.*, pp. 130–31.
- 22 *Mercury*, 7 April 1866, p. 6.
- 23 *Albion*, 9 April 1866, p. 5; *Courier*, 9 April 1866, p. 7.
- 24 *Hansard*, Vol. 185, 11 February 1867, p. 247.
- 25 e.g. *Mercury*, 18 February 1867, p. 6; *ibid.*, 20 February 1867, p. 6.
- 26 *Mercury*, 13 March 1867, p. 6.
- 27 Smith, *The Making of the Second Reform Bill*, pp. 148–67.
- 28 *Hansard*, Vol. 186, 18 March 1867, p. 45.
- 29 *Ibid.*, 25 March 1867, pp. 476–77.
- 30 Smith, *The Making of the Second Reform Bill*, pp. 172–73.
- 31 *Mercury*, 8 April 1867, p. 6; *ibid.*, 15 April 1867, p. 6; *Daily Post*, Supplement, 10 April 1867, p. 1; *Albion*, 8 April 1867, p. 4; *ibid.*, 15 April 1867, p. 4.
- 32 *Daily Post*, Supplement, 10 April 1867, p. 1.
- 33 *Mercury*, 15 April 1867, p. 6.
- 34 Smith, *Second Reform Bill*, pp. 184, 193–94, 196–99.
- 35 *Mercury*, 1 May 1867, p. 6.
- 36 Rathbone, *William Rathbone*, pp. 213–14; P. Searby, 'Gladstone in West Derby Hundred: The Liberal Campaign in S. W. Lancashire in 1868', *Transactions of the Historical Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, Vol. 111 (1959), p. 146.
- 37 Searby, *Trans. Hist. Soc. Lancs. & Cheshire*, Vol. 111, p. 140.
- 38 *Mercury*, 15 October 1868, pp. 6–7.
- 39 P. J. Waller, *Democracy and Sectarianism: A Political and Social History of Liverpool 1868–1939* (Liverpool University Press, Liverpool, 1981), p. 14.
- 40 Searby, *Trans. Hist. Soc. Lancs. & Cheshire*, Vol. 111, p. 146.
- 41 *Ibid.*, p. 152; H. C. G. Matthew (ed.), *The Gladstone Diaries* Vol. VI, 1861–68, (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1978), 8 September 1868, p. 622.
- 42 Searby, *Trans. Hist. Soc. Lancs. & Cheshire*, Vol. 111, p. 145.
- 43 *Courier*, 23 November 1868, p. 6.
- 44 *Ibid.*
- 45 Searby, *Trans. Hist. Soc. Lancs. & Cheshire*, Vol. 111, p. 161.
- 46 *Ibid.*, pp. 148–51.
- 47 *Mercury*, 25 November 1868, p. 6; Searby, *Trans. Hist. Soc. Lancs. & Cheshire*, Vol. 111, p. 161.
- 48 *Mercury*, 15 October 1868, p. 6.
- 49 *Ibid.*, 23 November 1868, p. 5.
- 50 *Ibid.*, 28 October 1868, p. 3.
- 51 *Ibid.*