

Businessmen in the House of Commons:
A Comparative Study of the 1852-1857 and the 1895-1900 Parliaments

BY

C2009

Alexander S. Rosser

Submitted to the graduate degree program in History and the
Graduate Faculty of the University of Kansas
In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Victor Bailey, Chairman

Theodore A. Wilson

Joshua L. Rosenbloom

J. C. D. Clark

Thomas J. Lewin

Date Defended 11 May, 2009

The Dissertation Committee for Alexander S. Rosser certifies
That this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

Businessmen in the House of Commons:
A Comparative Study of the 1852-1857 and the 1895-1900 Parliaments

Committee:

Victor Bailey, Chairman

Theodore A. Wilson

Joshua L. Rosenbloom

J. C. D. Clark

Thomas J. Lewin

Date Approved 11 May, 2009

Table of Contents

	Page
Table of Contents	3
Acknowledgements	4
List of Tables	5
List of Abbreviations	12
Introduction	16
Chapter One	Businessmen in the House of Commons, 1852-1857 26
Chapter Two	Businessmen in the House of Commons 1895-1900 110
Chapter Three	Comparison and contrasts between the Parliament of 1852-1857 and the Parliament of 1895-1900 241
Chapter Four	The Wiener Thesis of Late 20th Century British Business Failure 271
Endnotes	350
Bibliography	363

Acknowledgements

This project first started many years ago as a master's thesis under the direction of the late Professor John Stack of the University of Missouri at Kansas City. Professor Victor Bailey of the University of Kansas very graciously supported my efforts to extend the work to include a later Parliament and a detailed look at the Wiener Thesis. I wish to thank Professor Bailey for his great support and his great patience. As well I thank the Department of History, the Graduate School of the University of Kansas, and the other members of my committee, J. C. D. Clark, Thomas Lewin, Ted Wilson, and Joshua Rosenbloom, for their support and patience. The libraries of both Universities have had all of the resources necessary for this dissertation, and I thank and commend them.

R. Lymon Ott, Ph.D. provided valuable advice on statistics, Alison Swihart typed early drafts of chapters two through four, and Tom O'Brien and Carrie Sallee at Twenty-First Century Communications assisted with computer technical issues. I thank them all.

My wife has been patient as well and very supportive, and for that I will always thank her. To her, the children, and now the grandchildren, love always.

16 April 2009

Alex S. Rosser

List of Tables

Table Number	Title	Page
Chapter One		
1	Parliamentary Constituencies in 1852	27
2	The Business Activities of the 160 Business MPs Directly Engaged (Past or Present) in Business	31
3	1852-1857 Businessmen MPs own Business Interests and outside Directorships	37
4	Outside Directorships of Other MPs	39
5	Secondary Education of Parliamentarians in the Parliament of 1852-1857 by Percentage	43
6	Secondary Education of Business Parliamentarians in the Parliament of 1852-1857 by Percentage	44
7	Number of Members of the House of Commons in the Parliament of 1852-1857 Categorized by Profession or Income Source who attended a University	46
8	Percentage of Members of the House of Commons in the Parliament of 1852-1857 Categorized by Profession or Income source who attended a University	47
9	Non-Political Club Memberships by Profession/Income category in percentage Terms	49
10	Non-Political Club Memberships of Businessmen Disaggregated by Professions	50
11	Percentage of those members of different Profession/Income source in the Parliament of 1852-1857 who received honors	53
12	University Attendance by Profession/Income Classification	61

13	University Attendance by Profession/Income Classification Expressed in Percentage Terms	62
14	Attendance by 1852-1857 House of Commons Members at Oxford and Cambridge versus other Universities	63
15	Subjects debated in the House of Commons	75
16	Business MPs' Participation in the House of Commons Debates, 1852-1857	75
17	Backbench Business MPs' Participation in the House of Commons Debates, 1852-1857	76
18	The Subjects Investigated by the Select Committees of the House of Commons, 1852-1857	87
19	Business MPs' Participation on House of Commons Select Committees, 1852-1857	89
20	Businessmen as Witnesses before the House of Commons Select Committees, 1852-1857	94
21	The Subjects of the Public Bills Introduced into the House of Commons, 1852-1857	97
22	The Businessmen MPs' Sponsorship of Public Bills in the House of Commons, 1852-1857	98
23	The Business MPs' Sponsorship of Local and Private Bills in the House of Commons, 1852-1857	101
24	The Ranking of Business MP Participation by Subject Categories – In Speeches, Select Committees' Membership and Sponsorship of Public Bills in the House of Commons, 1852-1857	103
25	The Ranking of Subject Categories by Business MPs' Participation with Raw Scores	104

Chapter Two

26	Political Affiliation of MPs, 1895-1900	111
27	Profession/Income Group	112
28	Political Affiliation of Profession/Income Groups	113
29	Percentage of Professions/Income source by Parties	114

30	Each Profession/Income Source as a Percentage of Each Parliamentary Party	115
31	Profession/Income Groups in the Political Blocks, Parliament of 1895-1900	117
32	Percentage of Profession/Income groups by Party Affiliation in Parliament of 1895-1900	118
33	Land Ownership by Other Professions/Income Groups	119
34	Political Breakdown of Table 33	120
35	Positions Held by Barristers while in or after Parliamentary Service	132
36	Businessmen MPs' Own Business Interests and Outside Directorships, Parliament 1895-1900	142
37	Outside Directorships of Other MPs	167
38	Secondary Education of Parliamentarians in the Parliament of 1895-1900, by Percentage	172
39	Secondary Education of Business Parliamentarians in the Parliament of 1895-1900, by Percentage	174
40	Percentage of Each Professional Category of the Members of the House of Commons in the Parliament Of 1895-1900 who attended a University	176
41	Disaggregation of the business category in Table 40	177
42	Non-Political Club Memberships by Profession/Income Category in Percentage terms	180
43	Non-Political Club Memberships of Businessmen Disaggregated by Professions	181
44	Those Members of different Professions in the Parliament of 1895-1900 who received Honors	182
45	Percentage of those Members of Different Professions in the Parliament of 1895-1900 who received Honors	183
46	Political Affiliation by Business Sector	185-186
47	Known Religious Affiliations of MPs, Parliament of 1895-1900	188

48	Correlation of Religious Affiliation to Political Affiliation	188
49	Religion correlated to Profession/Income Category	190
50	Types of Committees in the Parliament of 1895-1900 and Business Participation on those Committees	192
51	Participation on Committees by Different Professions/Income Classifications	193
52	Parliamentary Bills, 1896-1900	199
53	Parliamentary Bills, 1896-1900, by Percentage	200
54	By Classification, Percentage of Bills Originating in the House of Commons, Parliament of 1895-1900	201
55	Percent of Printed House of Commons Bills with at least one Business Sponsor	202
56	Types of Bills by Number of Sponsors in Profession/Income Categories	203
57	Types of Bills by Percentage of Sponsor in Profession/Income Categories	204
58	Bill Sponsorship Ranked by Percentage of Business Sponsorship	205
59	Reallocation of Government Members by Previous Occupation	206
60	Reallocation of Government Members Merged with Bill Sponsors from Table 56	207
61	Reallocation of Government Members Merged with Bill Sponsors from Table 56 expressed as Percentages	208
62	House of Commons Bills Ranked by Percentage of Business Sponsorship after Reallocation of Government Members to their Previous Profession	209
63	Political Affiliation of Division for Third Reading Foreign Prison Made Goods Act of 1897	221
64	Profession/Income source of Members Voting on the Division for the Third Reading, Foreign Prison Made Act of 1897	221

65	Disaggregation of Businessmen in the Vote on the Foreign Prison Made Goods Act of 1897	223
66	Parliament of 1895-1900, House of Commons Standing Committee on Trade, by Party Affiliation And Profession/Income Source	225
67	Lines of Speech on Workmen's Compensation by Party and Profession (not including Chamberlain, Ridley, the Attorney General, and Asquith)	232
68	Lines of Speech on Workmen's Compensation by Party and Profession	232
69	Percentage of Speeches on Workmen's Compensation by Profession without Leaders	233
70	Percentage of Speeches on Workmen's Compensation by Profession with Government Leaders	233
71	Yes Vote on Division 218 including Tellers	235
72	No Vote on Division 218 including Tellers	235
73	Yes Vote on Division 281 including Tellers	236
74	No Vote on Division 281 including Tellers	236

Chapter Three

75	The Number of Businessmen in the Parliaments of 1852-1857, 1874-1880, and 1895-1900 by their Party Affiliation	242
76	Percentage of Attendance at Clarendon and Other Public Schools by Profession/Income Source, Parliament of 1852-1857	244
77	Percentage of Attendance at Clarendon and Other Public Schools by Profession/Income Source , Parliament of 1895-1900	245
78	Percentage of Each Professional Category of the Members of the House of Commons in the Parliament of 1895-1900 who attended University	249

79	Non-Political Club Memberships by Profession/ Income Category in Percentage Terms, Parliament of 1852-1857	251
80	Non-Political Club Memberships by Profession/ Income Category in Percentage Terms, Parliament of 1895-1900	252
81	Non-Political Club Memberships of Businessmen Compared to Barristers in the Parliament of 1852- 1857	252
82	Non-Political Club Memberships of Businessmen Compared to Barristers in the Parliament of 1852- 1857	253
83	Non-Political Club Memberships of Businessmen Disaggregated by Profession, Parliament of 1852 1857	254
84	Non-Political Club Memberships of Businessmen Disaggregated by Profession, Parliament of 1895 1900	254
85	Percentage of those Members of Different Professions in the Parliament of 1852-1857 who received Honors	256
86	Percentage of those Members of Different Professions in the Parliament of 1895-1900 who received Honors	256
87	Comparison between the Parliaments of 1852-1857 and 1895-1900 of the Percentage of Different Profession/Income Categories receiving Honors	257
88	Honors Bestowed on Businessmen in the Parliament of 1895-1900	258
89	Honors Bestowed on Bankers in the Parliament of 1895-1900	259
90	Honors Bestowed on Those in Other Finance/ Insurance in the Parliament of 1895-1900	259
Chapter Four		
91	Secondary Education of Parliamentarians in the Parliament of 1895-1900, by Percentage	282

92	Secondary Education of Business Parliamentarians in the Parliament of 1895-1900, by Percentage	283
93	Nobel Prizes Awarded in the Three Scientific Categories by Nationality of the Recipient 1901-1950	346
94	Nobel Prizes Awarded in the Three Scientific Categories by Nationality of the Recipient 1951-1980	346
95	Nobel Prizes Awarded in the Three Scientific Categories by Nationality of the Recipient 1901-1980	347
96	Nobel Prizes Awarded in the Three Scientific Categories by Nationality of the Recipient 1981-2008	348

List of Abbreviations

General

BA	Bachelor of Arts
Barr	Barrister
BBC	British Broadcasting Corporation
Bus	Business
Cam or Camb	Cambridge
Cult	Culture
DBB	Dictionary of Business Biography
DNB	Dictionary of National Biography
Edu	Educators
Emp	Empire
For Aff	Foreign Affairs
Econ	Economic
Govt	Government
Govt Adm	Government Administration
Govt Fin	Government Finance
Judic	Judiciary
Lab	Labour
Ltd	Limited Liability Company
MA	Master of Arts
MD	Medical Doctor
MP	Member of Parliament
Mil	Military
Ox	Oxford
Par	Parliament

PC	Privy Council
PLC	Public Limited Company
Rel	Religious
Sol or Solic	Solicitor
Ukn	Unknown
Write/Jour	Writer/Journalist

Honors

Bt. Baronet

Honors bestowed by the Monarch through one of the United Kingdom Orders of Chivalry are: Garter (G), Thistle (T), Saint Patrick (now in abeyance (P)), Bath (B), Star of India (now in abeyance (SI)), Saints Michael and George (MG), British Empire (BE), Indian Empire (now in abeyance (IE)), Crown of India (now in abeyance (CI)), and an additional order founded in 1896, the Victorian Order (VO). In descending order the titles within these orders of honor that can be bestowed are: Knight Grand Cross or Knight Grand Commander (for non-Christians) (GC or G) Knight Commander or Knight (KC or K) all of the forgoing including the honorific of 'Sir' or 'Dame,' as well as Companion (C) or Member (M), which do not. Thus a Knight of the Garter would be KG, of the Thistle KT, a Knight Grand Cross of the Order of Saints Michael and George GCMG, a Knight Commander of Saints Michael and George KCMG, and a Knight of Saints Michael and George KMG.

Kt. Knight Bachelor

Political

APIN	Anti-Parnellite Irish Nationalists
Bt.	Baronet
C.	Conservatives
C. U.	Conservatives who emphasize their support of the Union with Ireland
L.	Liberals
L. U.	Liberal Unionists

PHR	Parnellite Home Rulers
Rad.	Radicals
U.	Unionist

For Tables 3, 4, 36, 37

Acad	Academic
Brew	Brewers
Col	Colliery
Const	Construction
Dist	Distillers
Fin	Other Financial
Ins	Insurance
News Pub	Newspaper Publisher
RW	Railway
Ship	Ship Owners
Ship bldg	Ship-building and Marine Engineering
Tele	Telecommunications
Util	Utilities
Writ/Jour	Writers/Journalists

For Tables 93-96

Germ.	Germany
U.K.	United Kingdom
U.S.A.	United States of America

Fr.	France
Neth.	Netherlands
Switz.	Switzerland
Swed.	Sweden

Religion

BAP	Baptist
COE	Church of England
COI	Church of Ireland
CONG	Congregationalist
COS	Church of Scotland
J	Jewish
METH	Methodist
PRES	Presbyterian
Q	Quaker
RC	Roman Catholic
U	Unitarian

INTRODUCTION

On May 1, 1851, Queen Victoria officially opened the “Exhibition of the Works of Industry of All Nations,” which became known as the “Great Exposition” or the “Crystal Palace Exhibition”.¹ Great Britain was then the “workshop of the world,” and the Great Exposition was conceived to demonstrate the marvels that British manufacturing and engineering had wrought. Albion had reached the apex of power.

During the preceding century, Great Britain had become the world’s first industrialized nation. Between 1801 and 1851, its national product had more than tripled in absolute terms (from 138 million to 494 million pounds),² and it had almost doubled on a per capita basis. From 75.5 million pounds in 1801 “agriculture, forestry, and fishing” the largest sector of the national economy at the time, grew to over 106.5 million pounds in 1851, an increase of more than 41%. However, ‘mining, manufacturing, and building,’ the second largest sector in 1801 at 54.3 million pounds, more than tripled and was producing 179.5 million pounds in 1851, making it the largest sector of the national economy at over a third of the national product. This trend continued and accelerated throughout the rest of the nineteenth century so that in 1901, ‘mining, manufacturing, and building’, at 660.7 million pounds, was over six times the 104.6 million pounds of ‘agriculture, forestry, and fishing.’ This 660.7 million pounds represented over 40% of the British Gross Domestic Product in 1901 of 1624.9 million pounds.³ Thus, in an economy that had

grown in the first half of the nineteenth century by a factor of nearly 3.6, agriculture had increased only by 41% while mining, manufacturing, and building had grown by a factor of over 3.3. However, in the second half of the century, when the economy grew by a factor of 3.3, and the agricultural sector was essentially flat, mining, manufacturing, and building grew by a factor a factor of well in excess of 3.6. The end result was that by the end of the century agriculture had grown by only 40% over the previous century, all in the first half, while manufacturing had grown essentially evenly throughout the century by a factor of 12.

England's population also increased dramatically in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; starting from approximately 5.8 million people in England and Wales in 1750, the population more than tripled by 1851 to approximately 17.93 million, and nearly doubled again to over 32.5 million in 1901. Further, it is estimated that in 1851, 54% of the nation lived in urban districts, and by 1901 this proportion had risen to 77%.⁴ These economic and demographic changes inevitably altered the structure of British society, but the meaning of these changes were much debated by contemporaries and later by historians.

In his important and influential 1969 study, The Origins of Modern English Society, 1780-1880, Harold Perkin argued that whereas preindustrial England had been a one class society dominated by the landed elite (the aristocracy and gentry), industrial England saw the birth of a class society composed of four increasingly self-conscious and antagonistic groups: the landed elite, the entrepreneurial class, the professional elite, and the working class. Perkin also challenged the prevailing liberal

and Marxist paradigms by suggesting - in provocatively idealist language - that the entrepreneurial class became dominant because its “ideal” or values became dominant, rather than because of its economic power: “It is not so much that the ruling class imposes its ideal upon the rest, but that the class which manages to impose its ideal upon the rest becomes the ruling class ... Neither contemporaries nor historians have doubted that the capitalist middle class were the ‘real’ rulers of mid-Victorian England...”⁵

In the 1970s and 1980s, Perry Anderson and Tom Nairn attacked this view of middle class hegemony from the left while Martin Weiner launched an analogous attack from the liberal-conservative center.⁶ In his 1977 study, The Break-Up of Britain, Nairn suggested that the entrepreneurial elite was more supine than hegemonic and that it had not imposed its values on the landed elite but had rather sought accommodation with the old ruling class. The resulting compromise, according to Nairn, brought some benefits, particularly political and social stability and the humanization of early industrial capitalism. But it also brought considerable costs, particularly “... the containment of capitalism within a patrician hegemony which never, either then or since, actively favored the aggressive development of industrialism or the general conversion of society to the latter’s values and interests.”⁷

In a variation of this same thesis, Martin Weiner, in his widely appreciated 1981 study, English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit, 1850 - 1980, argued that the eclipse of English economic power could be traced to the subordination of the business elite’s values to those of the aristocracy and the

professional classes. The entrepreneur was not dominant but rather subservient. “As a rule,” Weiner wrote, “leaders of commerce and industry in England over the century have accommodated themselves to an elite culture blended of preindustrial aristocratic and religious values and more recent professional and bureaucratic values that inhibited their quest for expansion, productivity and profit.”⁸

These debates clearly suggest that historians of nineteenth century England are confused about the role of the entrepreneurial or business class. Were businessmen dominant leaders or were they merely subservient followers? Further, how did their position in this society change over time?

In order to shed some light on these crucial questions, we will analyze the activities of the businessmen who were elected to the House of Commons between 1852 and 1857 and those elected between 1895 and 1900. By studying what businessmen did in the most powerful political institution in the United Kingdom, it may be possible to help answer the larger question of the role of the entrepreneurial middle-class in the nineteenth century.

There are three reasons that the Parliament of 1852-1857 was chosen to be a part of this study. First, the election for this Parliament took place twenty years, a whole generation, after the passage of the Great Reform Act of 1832. If the reform of 1832 were a triumph by the entrepreneurial middle classes, it would be reasonable to expect that businessmen would have been able to consolidate their new position in the Parliament within this time period. And, indeed, the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846 is often taken as an example of this new power of business interests. Further, R. H. S.

Crossman in his introduction to the Cornell University reissue of Walter Bagehot's book The English Constitution, (which was first published in 1867 and referenced this and surrounding Parliaments), argued that Bagehot's description of the efficient part of the English Constitution, the Cabinet, perceived the Cabinet very much as a board of directors chosen by the Parliament, and that this form of organization was partly a result of the triumph of the ideals of the business middle classes.⁹ Yet Bagehot went on to argue that the government in its organizational structure was 'unsystematic and casual.'¹⁰ Thus a close look at this Parliament may show us if business or its ideal were as powerful in the Parliament in mid-century as has been assumed.

The second reason that the 1852-1857 Parliament is included in this study is that it is an understudied Parliament, caused in part, I believe, by the complex politics of this Parliament. Three different governments were formed in the course of this Parliament from three different parties, factions or coalitions. Following the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846, the Conservative or Tory Party had split into two factions, the first, the larger portion of the party, the Protectionists, were those who opposed the repeal. They were generally landed or associated with the landed. The other, largely composed of former government ministers and others who were closely associated with the man who led the successful repeal, former Conservative Prime Minister Sir Robert Peel, were, unsurprisingly, called the Peelites.

The election of 1852 was a split decision. The Whigs, Liberals and their allies won a majority of the popular vote, in excess of 55%, but the Tories won a bare

majority of the seats. However, the previously mentioned split in the Conservative party led to a minority Tory government with Lord Derby as Prime Minister and Disraeli as Chancellor of the Exchequer. This government promptly fell on the introduction of the budget by Disraeli. The Peelites, led by the Earl of Aberdeen as Prime Minister, and the Whigs and Liberals, led by Lord John Russell as Foreign Secretary and leader in the House of Commons, and Viscount Palmerston as Home Secretary, formed a coalition government that lasted from December 1852 until the end of January 1855. Trouble in the preparations and support of the British military in the Crimea led to the resignation of Aberdeen's administration. The third and last government formed during this Parliament was led by Viscount Palmerston, and dealt not only with the ending of the Crimean War, but also the Second Opium War. This war arose out of rather questionable activities by some British subjects in the Far East that led to a British consul taking decisive but excessive action against the Chinese. While most of the Cabinet felt the British were in the wrong, Palmerston insisted that the government had to support the activities of its on the spot officials and that the government had the responsibility to support and protect its subjects against any foreign governments. A motion in opposition to Palmerston's position was introduced in Parliament, and after four days of debate, passed by a sixteen vote margin. Consequently, Palmerston asked the Queen to dissolve Parliament, and in the subsequent election won an overwhelming victory at the polls, the greatest in over twenty years, as the nation rallied around his position, while two of his main opponents on the issue, Cobden and Bright, both lost their seats.

A third reason for choosing this Parliament was the that it was the one in which the election had taken place as close as possible to 1850, which is the start date for Wiener's thesis as to why British industry declined. Our subsequent Parliament, the one of 1895-1900, the last of Queen Victoria's Parliaments (she would die on 22 January 1901, before the new Parliament elected following the dissolution of our Parliament, was seated), is also tied to Wiener's thesis since Wiener states that the pattern of behavior upon which he places the blame for the decline of Britain's economy, that is, the mis-education of Britain's entrepreneurial elite's sons, is set by the end of Victoria's reign.

This later Parliament, being the terminal Parliament of the nineteenth century, also gives us an opportunity to study changes in the position of businessmen over the last half of the nineteenth century in Parliament, political parties, national government, and, through a review of social club memberships and honours, the perceptions of them in society. This review is not comprehensive, however, since it only looks at businessmen in Parliament, but not in the local governmental positions held by businessmen. Businessmen were often the leaders of towns and cities and they often held many, if not most, local public positions such as aldermen or mayors. A notable example of this is Joseph Chamberlain, who was a three-time mayor of Birmingham, and chairman of the local school board before his election to Parliament. Patrick Joyce, in his book, Work, Society, and Politics: The culture of the factory in later Victorian England, in writing about the ownership of Victorian factories in the north of England, emphasizes the growing importance of these

businessmen in the social and political positions in their localities. He also points out that many of these businessmen did not come anew to their counties and towns, but were often from families of some long standing locally.¹¹

The methodology of this study is prosopography, that is, a mass biography. Prosopographical research in British history begins with Sir Lewis Namier's groundbreaking study of the distribution of power and rewards in mid-eighteenth century Parliament and government. Following the Second World War, J. E. Neale suggested that group biography might provide useful insights into nineteenth century British history. Unbeknownst to him, W. O. Aydelotte of the University of Iowa (professor to the late John Stack, my advisor at the University of Missouri at Kansas City) had already started such a project. His subject was the Parliament of 1841-1847. The archive he developed became the basis of several papers, articles, and chapters of books in which he discussed the percentage of businessmen in this particular Parliament (22%) in an article in *History*,¹² voting patterns in the House of Commons,¹³ and constituency influence on the House of Commons.¹⁴

In Aydelotte's work, when businessmen were analyzed, they were defined as an undifferentiated cohesive group. Here we will differ. We will endeavor to break down the undifferentiated mass of businessmen by their business lines, and will look to see if there are different patterns of behavior and position between them. Thus bankers will be broken out from other financiers, and both will be broken out from railway men and steel mongers, who in turn, will be separated from each other and from other business professions such as cotton spinners, and so forth.

Prosopographical research does have its limitations. It has only recently been pursued to any great degree because of the development of the computer which has facilitated large statistical studies. Prosopography can hide details of individual lives. Therefore, in addition to the prosopographical study, we will use examples of individuals to try to deepen and give some color to our understanding of the MPs in these Parliaments.

The final chapter will be a look at the Wiener thesis using information developed in the course of this study, especially the information involving the later Parliament. Martin Wiener is a cultural historian who offered an explanation for the decline of British industry. He laid the blame for this decline at the feet of Thomas Arnold, whose influence on British secondary education in the first half of the nineteenth century was perpetuated through the Conference of Headmasters throughout the rest of the century and into the twentieth century. The result of Dr. Arnold's educational philosophy, according to Professor Wiener, was the creation of a class of ill-educated scions of entrepreneurs who inherited the businesses built up by their fathers or other relatives, but who were unable to successfully run the business. While Wiener was not the first to suggest this concept (we will look at its predecessors in chapter four), he developed it further. However, it has had its detractors, notably W. D. Rubinstein, who argued that England was never primarily an industrially oriented country, but rather had always been more of a commercial, finance and insurance based economy, and that therefore the decline of British industry was an understandable phenomenon not necessarily related to Dr. Arnold's

teachings.¹⁵ Part of our critique of Wiener will be an attempt to follow the history of some of the businessmen who sat in this last Parliament of the nineteenth century, some of who, or whose children or grandchildren, had been educated under the Arnoldian philosophy and try to discover the eventual disposition of their businesses.

Chapter One

BUSINESSMEN IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, 1852-1857

Background

At the general election of 1852, 658 men were elected to the House of Commons. Between 1852 and 1857, 121 additional MPs were chosen in by-elections to seats vacated by death, resignation, or expulsion. Thus a total of 779 men sat as members of the House of Commons in this Parliament.

In 1852 the House of Commons contained three different types of seats - 253 county, 399 borough, and 6 university (see Table 1). In the boroughs the franchise was restricted to adult males possessing property with an annual rental value of ten pounds while in the counties it was restricted to adult males possessing property with an annual rental value of forty shillings. (These restrictive property qualifications meant that only one male in five could vote in England and Wales, one in eight in Scotland, and one in twenty in Ireland.¹) If an individual had graduated from one of the privileged universities (Oxford, Cambridge, or Trinity College in Dublin), he would also have had a university franchise in addition to his borough and/or county franchises. In other words, there was plural voting. There was no universal male franchise. As well, constituencies varied greatly in size and representation. In 1852 some very small boroughs (such as Peterborough, with a population of 8,672) returned two MPs, while some very large boroughs (such as Marylebone, with a population of 370,957) returned the same number of MPs.²

The privileged male voters usually selected an M.P. from a short list of two or three candidates who generally espoused either conservative or liberal views. The Conservative

Table 1
Parliamentary Constituencies in 1852

Nation	County Seat	Borough Seat	University Seat	Total
England	144	323	4	481
Wales	15	14	0	29
Scotland	30	23	0	53
Ireland	64	39	2	6
Total	253	399	6	658

[Source: Derived from Norman Gash, Aristocracy and People, Britain 1815-1865, Harvard, Cambridge, Mass., 1979, Appendix C.]

(or Tory) Party in the middle of the nineteenth century had evolved from the eighteenth century amalgamation of the administrative Tories (who had supported the Monarch in his struggle to maintain his independence, choose his own ministers, and have a say in policy), and the social Tories (who believed in rule by the traditional landed elite, defense of existing governmental institutions, protectionism, and the established Church of England.)³ Sometimes allied with the Conservatives, but sometimes opposed to them, were the “Peelites”. As followers of the former great Conservative leader and Prime Minister, Robert Peel (who died in a riding accident in 1850), the Peelites advocated a “progressive conservatism,” and were especially critical of protectionism. Many prominent Peelites (including William Gladstone) eventually became Liberals.⁴

Opposed to the Conservatives was an even more complicated “Liberal” political bloc. It was composed of MPs who identified themselves as “Liberal,” “Whig,” “Reformer,” “Radical,” or “Repealer.” The “Whigs” had been the traditional opposition to the Tories. They believed in rule by an aristocratic landed elite (who were to be the guardians of the people against the monarchy), as well as in free trade, religious tolerance, and reform. Included in their ranks were aristocrats, businessmen, and religious dissenters. By 1852 many of those who had formerly called themselves “Whig” now called themselves “Liberal” or “Reformer.”⁵

The “Radicals” were Benthamites or followers of Jeremy Bentham and his philosophy of “utility.” They believed in strict laissez-faire in economic matters while simultaneously endorsing government intervention in social and administrative matters.⁶ Finally, the “Repealers” were the followers of Daniel O’Connell, who advocated the repeal of the 1801 Act of Union of Ireland with Great Britain. Because all these factions were seeking change and reform they found it convenient to work together.⁷

The Parliament of 1852-1857 was ruled by three different governments. Between 23 February 1852 and 17 December 1852 the Conservatives were in power. They were led by the Earl of Derby (Prime Minister) and Benjamin Disraeli (Chancellor of the Exchequer and leader of the party in the Commons). When Disraeli presented his budget, however, support for this government collapsed and the Conservatives resigned.

Between 19 December 1852 and 30 January 1855 Lord Aberdeen headed a coalition government made up of Peelites and Liberals. The Prime Minister (Aberdeen) and the Chancellor of the Exchequer (William Gladstone) were Peelites, but the Foreign Secretary (Lord John Russell), the Home Secretary (Lord Palmerston), and the Secretary for the Colonies (Sir George Grey) were “Liberals” or “Whigs.”

The last government in this Parliament was in power from 6 February 1855 to 21 March 1857. It was basically Liberal, but it also enjoyed the support of some Peelites. The Prime Minister (Lord Palmerston), the Home Secretary (Sir George Grey) and the Foreign Secretary (Earl of Clarendon) were “Liberals” or “Whigs,” but several “Peelites,” including the Chancellor of the Exchequer (William Gladstone), the Secretary for the Colonies (Sidney Herbert), and the Secretary of the Admiralty (Sir John Graham), continued in the government for a short time before resigning. Interestingly, two of Peel’s sons had by this time declared themselves to be “Liberals” and served in this new government for several years.

The Crimean War was the most important problem to preoccupy this Parliament. Britain drifted into this conflict when the fissures in Aberdeen’s cabinet made a coherent policy vis-à-vis Russia impossible. Aberdeen was conciliatory toward Russia, Palmerston was aggressive, and Russell was vacillating and preoccupied by his attempts to succeed Aberdeen in the premiership. War resulted, and the incompetence displayed by the government in its prosecution - combined with the fissures within the ministry - led to

Aberdeen's replacement by Palmerston. One other issue also embroiled the nation at this time: the Pope's reestablishment of a Catholic hierarchy in England and Wales. Militant Protestants in both the "Liberal" and "Conservative" parties saw this as an arrogant assertion of Papal power and as a gross attack on English independence and liberty. The major accomplishments of these three governments were the reform of the financial system, the reform of the laws on partnerships and limited liability, and the partial reform of the civil service and of Oxford and Cambridge.

The Social Composition of the 1852-1857 House of Commons

In order to study the impact of the business MPs on the 1852-1857 House of Commons, it was first necessary to determine the social and occupational identities of the 779 Members elected to that House. To do this an alphabetically cataloged card file listing all of the elected representatives appearing in Dod's Parliamentary Companion was created. One card was devoted to each Member of Parliament (MP), and on each card the MP's political party, constituency, titles, profession, education, family background, marital status, residential addresses, clubs, and positions on selected issues were entered. Further biographical data was obtained from Burke's Peerage, Burke's Landed Gentry, Boase's Modern English Biography, the Dictionary of National Biography, Boylan's Dictionary of Irish Biography, Bateman's Great Landholders of Great Britain and Ireland, the British Biographical Archive: Seventeenth through the Nineteenth Centuries, and the Dictionary of Business

Biography.⁸

On the basis of the above analysis it was determined that 177 of the 779 MPs elected to the House of Commons were involved in business. But what constitutes a businessman? Of course, those who had been or were directly engaged in business would qualify, and 160 MPs had been or were so engaged. The largest fraction of these business MPs were merchants, but the other major types of business activity were also well represented (see Table 2).

Table 2
The Business Activities of the 160 Business MPs
Directly Engaged (Past or Present) in Business

Business Activity	Number
Commerce	41
Banking, Insurance, Other Financial	35
Industry	29
Other	21
Multiple Business Interests	17
Transportation (Coaches, Railways, and Shipping)	17
Total	160

[Sources: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1852-1857, The Dictionary of National Biography, Boase's Modern English Biography, Boylan's Dictionary of Irish Biography, the British Biographical Archive: Seventeenth through the Nineteenth Centuries, and the Dictionary of Business Biography.]

Illustrative of the merchant MPs in this House of Commons was Sir (Nicholas) James Sutherland Matheson, Bt., (L., Rosshire) co-founder of Jardine Matheson. Born in 1796 in Lairg, Sutherlandshire, he was the second of three sons of Captain Donald Matheson. After attending the Royal High School and the University of Edinburgh, he spent two years at a London agency house before being sent out to

Calcutta in 1815. From there he moved to China, and by the early 1820s was the Danish Consul at Canton and a partner in the firm of Yrissari and Company, which was renamed Matheson and Company in 1827. In 1828 William Jardine, a fellow Scot, brought him into Magniac and Company which was reconstituted in 1832 as Jardine, Matheson and Company. While banking, shipping, insurance, and marketing on commission may have provided the largest part of the firm's revenue, opium smuggling provided the hard currency. In 1842 he returned to England, married, purchased a huge estate in Scotland, reorganized Magniac and Jardine of London as Matheson and Company, and became Chairman of the Peninsular and Oriental Steamship Company. He sat in Parliament for Ashburton from 1843 to 1847 and for Ross from 1847 to 1868. He received his baronetage in 1850, and died in 1878.⁹

George Carr Glyn (L., Kendall) is illustrative of the business MPs in banking. He was born in 1797, the fifth son of Sir Richard Carr Glyn, first Baronet. After being educated at Westminster public school, he joined his father's bank, Glyn, Halifax, Mills and Company. In 1830 he was made a partner and, in time, became head of the firm. He was also a director, and later chairman, of the London and Birmingham Railway, as well as chairman of its successor, the London and Northwestern Railway. He represented Kendal from 1847 until his elevation to the peerage as Baron Wolverton in 1868. He died in 1873 leaving an estate of just under £1,000,000. His most notable appearance in this Parliament was when on July 24, 1855 he rose to complain that the House was not keeping to its schedule and thus was interfering with his other appointments. This brought a withering reply from

Palmerston.¹⁰

Apsley Pellatt (L., Southwark) is a good example of an English manufacturer who was also an MP. He was born in 1791, the eldest son of a man of the same name. The younger Pellatt followed his father into the family business, glass manufacturing in Southwark. He held three patents involving glass manufacturing, the first concerning glass incrustation of other materials, the second concerning the manufacturing of pressed glass, and the last concerning improvements in the composition and manufacturing of blown, pressed and cut glass. In 1849 he published a history of glass. He sat for Southwark from 1852 to 1857, spoke often in the House, and introduced legislation concerning Dissenters' marriages in 1854, 1855, and 1856. He was a Congregationalist. Pellatt died in 1863.¹¹

Adam Black (L., Edinburgh) is an example of someone who falls into the "other" category. Born in 1784, to an Edinburgh builder, he attended the High School and one session at Edinburgh University. He was apprenticed to a bookseller in Edinburgh for five years, and then spent two years as an assistant in the publishing house of Lockington, Allen and Company in London. In 1808 he returned to Edinburgh to open his own business. Eventually he took a nephew into his firm. Upon the failure of another publisher, Archibald Constable and Company, he acquired the copyright to the Encyclopedia Britannica, and published the seventh and eighth editions. In 1851 his firm acquired the rights to many of Scott's works, including the Waverley novels. Long involved in local politics (he was twice Lord Provost of Edinburgh), Black was elected to the House of Commons to represent

Edinburgh. He remained in the House until 1865. Black died in 1874 and a statue dedicated to him was erected in Edinburgh in 1877.¹²

Many of the businessmen who sat in the House of Commons had multiple business interests. Alderman William Thompson (C., Westmoreland) is an example of an MP with extremely diverse business interests. Born in 1793, the son of James Thompson of Grayrigg near Kendal, he made his fortune as an iron master. Subsequently he became deeply involved with the railways, was a director of the Bank of England, and was chairman of the Committee at Lloyds. He was also very active in local politics being an Alderman in London from 1821 until his death, Sheriff of London in 1823, and Lord Mayor in 1829. He was a member of the House of Commons for the City of London from 1826 to 1832, for Sunderland from 1835 to 1841, and for Westmoreland from 1841 to his death in 1854. He was also president of Christ's hospital, treasurer of King's College, London, and a Colonel in the Royal London Militia.¹³

Those involved in transportation can be represented by one of the most famous men of the time, George Hudson (C., Sunderland). Born in 1800, the son of a Yorkshire farmer, he became a successful draper in York. In 1833 he founded a bank in the city. He became the chairman of the York and North Midland Railway in 1839, of the Newcastle and Darlington in 1842, and eventually of the Midland Railway. His nickname was "the Railway King." In time, due to over speculation in railway shares, he was forced to resign from his positions and retire to the continent. He was twice elected Mayor of York, first in 1837 and then in 1846. He

sat for Sunderland from 1845 to 1859. He died in 1871.¹⁴

On the other hand, we will see that many of the Members of Parliament who are involved in the railroads were more highly placed socially than Hudson. An extreme example of this is Richard Plantagenet Campbell Temple-Nugent-Brydges-Chandos-Grenville, Marquess of Chandos, representative of Buckingham from 1846 to 1857. Appointed as a Lord of the Treasury in 1852, within the year he resigned to act as keeper of the privy seal to the Prince of Wales, and to assume the chairmanship of the London and North Western Railway, a position he held until succeeding to his father's title as the third Duke of Buckingham and Chandos. Formed in 1846 by a merger of three railways, the Grand Junction, London and Birmingham, and Manchester and Birmingham railways, the London and Northwestern railway was for much of the nineteenth century the largest joint stock company in the world.

We can create a table that shows all of the businessmen, their interests and any other business interests. As one views the table, the furthest left side column is the profession, next is the number of men in this Parliament who had that as their primary business interest, then the columns to the right are any other interests that they might have. Thus, two of the bankers were also brewers or on the board of a brewery (see table 3 below).

In addition to the 160 business MPs who had been or were directly involved in business, there were also 17 MPs who were directors of companies: two of banks, nine of railways, three of assurance companies, one of a water works, one of

several publishing houses, and one of an iron works. I have included these directors in this study, although I list them separately and do not delve deeply into their educational and social background. Including these seventeen is a departure from previous studies. W. O. Aydelotte, in his study “The House of Commons in the 1840’s,” excluded directors from his list of businessmen because he argued there was the possibility that members of company boards were not necessarily involved in decision making, and that experience on a board might have very little impact upon a person’s beliefs and actions.¹⁵ I differ with Aydelotte’s approach. Directors, after all, oversaw the decision making of the organization, and often the individual directors had either a specialized knowledge of, or a substantial financial interest in the company and thus a considerable personal interest in what was transpiring in the company and its industry.

Table 3
1852-1857 Businessmen MPs Own Business Interests and Outside Directorships

		Bank	Ins	Fin	Ship	RW	Cotton	Wool & Linen	Merchant	Steel	Const	Ship-Bldg	Tele	Brew	Dist	Util	Col.	News Pub	Other	Total
Bank	30	1	4			4								2		1			6	18
Ins	3	1			1	1											1			5
Fin	3	1	1			2							2						1	7
Ship	6		2								1								2	5
RW	11	1	4													1				6
Cotton	11					2													1	3
Wool & Linen	1																			
Merchant	44	4	3		2	8								1						18
Steel	8	2				2										1			1	6
Const	4					2													1	3
Ship-Bldg	1																			
Tele	0																			
Brew	7																			
Dist	0																			
Util.	1																			
Col.	2		1													1				2
News Pub	7																		1	1
Other	18	2	2		1	5		1		1	1					1			1	15
Total	160	12	17		4	23		1		2	2		2	2		5	1		14	

[Sources: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1852-1857, The Dictionary of National Biography, Boase's Modern English Biography, Boylan's Dictionary of Irish Biography, the British Biographical Archive: Seventeenth through the Nineteenth Centuries, and the Dictionary of Business Biography.]

Key: Brew – Brewers; Col – Collieries; Const – Construction Contractors; Dist – Distillers; Fin – Other Financial; Ins – Insurance; New Pub – Newspaper Publisher; RW – Railways; Ship – Ship Owners; Ship bldg Mar Eng – Ship building and Marine Engineering; Tele – Telecommunications; Util – Utilities; see also List of Abbreviations, pp. xii-xv.

To read this table: First column on reader's left is list of lines of business, second column is number of MPs whose primary business is in that field, remainder of columns to the right represents number of those in the second column who have interests in these other fields. Thus, one of thirty bankers also sits on another bank's board.

This is not to say that there may not have been some directors who viewed their positions on a company board as merely incidental to their lives. But of the seventeen I list as directors: six were lawyers who undoubtedly had business cases and thus some familiarity with trade; one was a director of several publishing companies, thus multiplying his experience in this business; two later became chairmen of the boards of the railroads on whose boards they sat; one was an economist (Samson Ricardo, L., Windsor); and one, when he died, left over one million pounds of stock in the railroad of which he was a director. To completely ignore the directors would be to ignore some very knowledgeable and capable business decision makers. Below is Table 4, a listing of these outside directors by their primary occupation and the types of companies on whose boards they sat.

Table 4

Parliament of 1852-1857, Outside Directorships of Other MPs

		Bank	Ins	Fin	Ship	RW	Cotton	Wool & Linen	Steel	Const	Ship Bldg	Tele	Brew	Dist	Util	Call	News Pub	Other	Total	
Land	1					1														1
Govt	4					1													2	3
Mili	3					3														3
Barr	4	2	1			3														6
Sal	2		1			1														2
MD																				
Writ/ Jour																				
Other	3		1						1											3
Total	17	2	3			9			1										2	

[Sources: Dod’s Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900, The Dictionary of National Biography, Boase’s Modern English Biography, Boylan’s Dictionary of Irish Biography, the British Biographical Archive: Seventeenth through the Nineteenth Centuries, and the Dictionary of Business Biography.]

To read this table, the column on the tables left as we look at it lists the non-business professions represented in this Parliament. The second column is the number of members of that non-business profession who had business interests or board memberships outside their main profession. The remainder of the columns indicate the number of interests in the previously identified business fields. Thus, I have identified three landholders as having sat on one bank board, one insurance company board, one railway, one steel company, and two other company’s boards. Twelve involved in government sat on at least 20 boards that I have been able to identify including three banks, five railways and four in the ‘other’ category.

The 160 businessmen directly involved in trade constituted 20.5% of the 779 identified MPs elected to this Parliament. If these seventeen non-management directors are added to the 160 businessmen who had been or were directly involved in business, the total is 177 business MPs or 22.7% of the elected members of Parliament. Furthermore, of the 658 House of Commons members sitting at any given time, the percentage who were business MPs varied from a low of 22.5% in 1852 to a high of 23.7% in 1855. Therefore, we can comfortably say that over 20% of the MPs of this Parliament were businessmen, and nearly 23% had some involvement in business.

Some MPs that one might think should have been included in the business MP category have been left out. The directors of the East India Company (EIC) were left out unless they had otherwise been in business, because at the reissuing of the EIC's charter in 1833 the company had been ordered to cease trade.¹⁶ West India proprietors were left out because there is no clear evidence that they engaged in anything beyond agriculture. There were also four Barings in this Parliament, but only one who seems to have been actively engaged in trade and only he has been counted as a business MP. Furthermore, the barrister of the Bank of England was in this Parliament, but he also is not listed, because although he was undoubtedly knowledgeable about business matters, there is no proof that he was an active business decision maker. Also excluded were forty MPs who were not personally engaged in business but who grew up in households where fathers, uncles, or grandfathers had been in business.

In addition to the 160 business MPs and seventeen directors elected to the House of Commons between 1852 and 1857, there were also some 602 other MPs. Most of these had military, government, legal, or landed backgrounds. Sir Maurice Berkeley (L., Gloucester City), later Baron Fitzharding, is an example of a member of the military. Born in 1788, he was the second son of the Earl of Berkeley. He entered the Navy in June, 1802, as a lieutenant. In 1808, he was on the Frigate “Hydra.” In 1810 he was Flag-Lieutenant to his cousin Vice-Admiral G. C. Berkeley on the “Barfleur” and later that year was in charge of a division of gunboats. At the end of 1810 he commanded the “Vestal.” From 1828 to 1831 he was in command of the “Semiramis,” at Cork, and in 1840 and 1841 of a ship of the line, the “Thunderer,” at the capture of Acre. Between 1833 and 1857 he was on and off the Admiralty Board. Promoted to Rear Admiral in 1849, he became Vice-Admiral in 1856, and Full Admiral in 1862. He married twice, and received a peerage in 1861. Baron Fitzharding died in 1867.¹⁷

George Heneage Walker Heneage (later Wyld) (C., Devizes) is an example of an MP in government service. He was Hereditary Chief Usher of the Court of the Exchequer, and Chief Proclaimer of the Court of Common Pleas. Born in 1799 and educated at Westminster School and Christ Church, Oxford, Heneage married in 1824, and represented Devizes from 1838 to 1857. He died in 1875.¹⁸

John Arthur Roebuck (Reform, Sheffield) is illustrative of those MPs who had legal backgrounds. Born in Madras in 1802, he returned to England in 1807 after his father died. Upon his mother’s remarriage, they moved to Canada. He

was educated there and in England, and after study at the Inner Temple was called to the bar and traveled the Northern Circuit. He was the English agent of the House of Assembly of Lower Canada in 1835, and in 1843 he was named a Q. C. He sat in parliament for Bath from 1832 to 1837, and for Sheffield from 1841 to 1847, 1849 to 1868, and finally from 1874 to his death in 1879. He was a follower of Bentham. His motion for a committee to investigate the government's management of the Crimean War led to the fall of Aberdeen's coalition.¹⁹

There were more than 300 landed gentlemen who were in this Commons. Some were the heirs of great peers. Lord Lovaine (C., Northumberland North), for example, was the heir of the Earl of Beverly and the heir presumptive of the Duke of Northumberland, while the Earl of March (C., Sussex West) was the heir of the Duke of Richmond. More typical, however, was Edward Holland (L., Evesham). Born in 1806, he was the son of Samuel Holland, a London merchant. Like many merchants before them, the Hollands had invested in land and had become landed gentry. Hence Edward Holland had 2,145 acres producing £3,947 a year, according to Bateman's study. Furthermore, Holland's land holdings also entitled him to be a patron of one living (a Church position). He sat in the Commons from 1835 to 1837 and from 1855 to 1868. He was a strong promoter of agricultural improvement and helped to found the Royal Agricultural College at Cirencester. He died in 1875.²⁰

A World Apart

Education

Although the business MPs constituted over 20% of the MPs elected to

Parliament between 1852 and 1857, they were - in many ways - a distinct and separate minority. Their social apartness is perhaps best appreciated by looking at their schooling, or, more precisely, their lack thereof. Of the 779 MPs, 352 (or just over 45%) had attended a public school. However, whereas 318 (or 52.8%) of the 602 non-business MPs had attended such an institution, only 35 (or 21.9 %) of the 160 business MPs had done so. Furthermore, business MPs were especially unlikely to have attended the most prestigious public schools, the Clarendon schools: Eton, Harrow, Winchester, Westminster, Rugby, Shrewsbury, St. Paul's, Charterhouse, and Merchant Taylors. Whereas the range for attendance at the Clarendon schools runs from nearly sixty percent for those in government service to a low of zero percent for those who went on to medicine or were solicitors, businessmen, at under twenty percent, are certainly near the bottom.

Table 5
Secondary Education of Parliamentarians in
The Parliament of 1852 – 1857
By Percentage

Profession	Clarendon Schools	Other Public Schools	Other	Unknown
Gov't Serv.	59.4	3.0	6.0	27.6
Land Ownership	50.2	.4	2.6	46.8
Military	36.0	1.1	3.4	59.6
Barrister	30.8	6.5	14.0	48.6
Business	17.5	4.4	17.5	60.6
Writer/Journalist	12.5	0	37.5	50.0
Solicitor	0	0	50.0	50.0
Medical Doctor	0	0	100.0	0
Other/Unknown	39.4	0	16.3	61.9

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1852-1857.]

One can disaggregate the business listing above to see if there is much variance within the category between different business professions resulting in table

6:

Table 6
Secondary Education of Business Parliamentarians
In the Parliament of 1852-1857
By Percentage

Occupation	Clarendon Schools	Other Public Schools	Other Schools	Unknown
Banker	36.6	0	6.7	56.7
Insurance/OtherFinance	40.0	0	0	60.0
Shipping	0	0	25.0	75.0
Railways	33.3	0	25.0	41.7
Cotton	0	0	9.0	91.0
Wool	0	0	0	100.0
Linen	33.3	0	66.7	0
Steel/Iron	14.3	0	14.3	71.4
Construction	0	0	0	100.0
Marine Eng.	0	0	0	100.0
Utility	50.0	0	0	50.0
Brewer	66.7	0	16.7	16.7
Colliery	0	0	0	100.0
Publishers and Printers	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0
Other	5.6	6.9	16.7	70.8

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1852-1857.]

Clearly the attendance at the Clarendon and the other public schools, such as they were in the first third of the nineteenth century in Britain (one must remember that most MPs in this Parliament had been in secondary school sometime around the beginning of the century to no later than about 1840) by businessmen was pretty 'lumpy.' Certain occupations, brewing, utilities (although this category has only two members, and thus may not be representative), other finance and insurance, and banking had Clarendon boys well in excess of the total business percentage from the

previous table 5. Railways were a relatively new business which, however, seems to have attracted a large number of Clarendon boys. Many of the other industries, notably those which would flounder in the last third of the twentieth century, seem to have attracted few Clarendon graduates to them, with cotton, wool, marine engineering and collieries at zero percent Clarendon graduates, and iron and steel at just over 14 %.

Attendance at Clarendon schools by brewers exceeded that of members of the government (Table 5), the highest ranking of the other professional categories. Ignoring utilities because of the small sample, the category ‘other finance/insurance’ (which has four insurance company officers and one stockbroker, the stockbroker having attended Eton) and ‘bank’ rank between ‘land ownership’ and ‘military’, that is rankings two and three, on Table 5, with ‘railways’ and ‘linen’ falling just behind the ‘military’ on Table 5. With the exception of the railways, these business occupations that have high Clarendon school attendance rates are old type businesses, brewing and banking having been practiced for centuries and insurance for over one and a half centuries at least.

An analysis of university attendance produces a similar pattern. In the mid-nineteenth century there were four traditional “establishment” universities in the United Kingdom: Oxford, Cambridge, Trinity College (Dublin), and Edinburgh. Scotland also had three other old universities: Aberdeen, Glasgow, and St. Andrews. In addition there were four new colleges and universities, Durham (1832), University College, London (1826), Kings College, London (1829) (both constituents of the

University of London), and Queen’s College, Ireland (1850). Also the military had service academies at Sandhurst, Woolwich, Portsmouth, and Aldershot. And medical doctors had advanced training, usually attending a university then training at a hospital. Approximately 63.7% of the non-business MPs had attended one of the above listed colleges, universities, or advanced institutions, but only 24.4% of the business MPs had done so. Furthermore, the businessmen MPs were more likely to have attended a Scottish institution than their fellow MPs. Hence, of the thirty-nine business MPs who attended a college or university, eleven (or 28.2%) attended Scottish institutions, whereas, of the 393 non-business MPs who attended a college or university only eighteen (or 4.6%) enrolled at one of the Scottish institutions.

Table 7
Number of Members of the House of Commons in the Parliament of 1852-1857
Categorized by Profession or Income source who attended a University

Profession / Income source	Oxford	Cam-bridge	Trinity Dublin	Edin-burgh	Other Scots	Other Irish	Lon-don	Other Eng.	For-eign	Military or surgical	Total
Land	97	42	4	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	151
Govt. Serv.	29	18	4	3	0	1	0	1	1	2	59
Military	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	26
Barrister	23	27	17	9	0	2	1	1	2	2	84
Solicitor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Med. Doc.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Writer/ Journalist	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Other	26	21	6	2	0	1	0	1	1	0	58
Business	10	10	3	5	5	0	1	0	2	0	36
Total	192	128	36	24	5	4	2	3	10	18	422

[Sources: Dod’s Parliamentary Companion, 1852-1857, The Dictionary of National Biography, Boase’s Modern English Biography, Boylan’s Dictionary of Irish Biography, the British Biographical Archive: Seventeenth through the Nineteenth Centuries, and the Dictionary of Business Biography.]

If we recalculate advanced education as percentages we get the table below. The percentage of medical doctors with advance education is 100%, followed by those in government at over 85%, writers at 75%, barristers at nearly 75%, and land and ‘other’ at over 55%. Business follows at nearly 23% beating only solicitors at zero percent.

Table 8
Percentage of Members of the House of Commons in the Parliament of 1852-1857
Categorized by Profession or Income source who attended a University

Profession / Income source	Oxford	Cambridge	Trinity Dublin	Edinburgh	Other Scots	Other Irish	London	Other English	Foreign	Military or surgical	Total Percent per row
Land	41.3	17.9	1.7	2.1	0	0	0	0	.4	.9	64.3
Govt. Serv.	43.3	25.4	6.0	4.5	0	1.5	0	1.5	1.5	3.0	86.7
Military	6.9	4.6	2.3	0	0	0	0	0	3.4	12.6	29.8
Barrister	20.7	24.3	15.3	8.1	0	1.8	.9	.9	1.8	.9	74.7
Solicitor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Med. Doc.	0	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50.0	100.0
Writer/ Journalist	12.5	62.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75.0
Other	24.8	20.0	5.7	1.9	0	1.0	0	1.0	1.0	0	55.4
Business	6.3	6.3	1.9	3.1	3.1	0	.6	0	1.3	0	22.6

[Sources: Dod’s Parliamentary Companion, 1852-1857, The Dictionary of National Biography, Boase’s Modern English Biography, Boylan’s Dictionary of Irish Biography, the British Biographical Archive: Seventeenth through the Nineteenth Centuries, and the Dictionary of Business Biography.]

If we break down the businessmen who attended university by their specific line of work, four of six (66.7%) of the brewers attended university, two at Oxford, one at Cambridge and one at Trinity-Dublin; four of seven of the printers/publishers (57.1%) attended university, two at Oxford, one each at Edinburgh and London; five of twelve in railways (41.7%), three at Oxford, one at Cambridge and one at Edinburgh; one of the three in the linen trade attended Cambridge; fifteen of seventy-

two in the 'other' category (largely merchants and manufacturer) (20.8%) of whom four attended Cambridge, four at the other Scottish universities, three at Edinburgh, two at Trinity-Dublin, and one at Oxford, and a foreign university; five of the thirty bankers (16.7%) attended university, two at Oxford, two at Cambridge and one at a foreign university; one of six of the businessmen in iron and steel had attended Glasgow University, one of the other Scottish universities; and one of the nine in the cotton trade had attended Cambridge.

These results again show that it was old trades, brewing and publications, which had an unusually large percentage of university attendees, as well as the new industry of railways.

Clubs

Victorian England was known for its gentlemen's clubs. Many of the earliest clubs still extant at this time included Whites, Boodles, Brooks's, and Alfred. Whites, the oldest, had evolved out of a chocolate shop opened at the end of the seventeenth century. Boodles and Brooks's had eighteenth century foundations. Alfred was formed in the early nineteenth century.²¹ Following the Napoleonic wars, certain specialty clubs and military clubs were founded. United University Club opened in 1821, Oxford and Cambridge hived off in 1830 as the waiting list was too long at the United University.²² The Athenaeum²³ for the literate and the Travellers²⁴ for those who had been more than 500 miles from London were founded in the early nineteenth century. Military clubs including the United Services, Army and Navy and the Naval and Military were founded in succession during the first two-thirds of

the nineteenth century.²⁵ Well known political clubs, the Carlton and the Reform were founded in the eighteen-thirties.²⁶

Club memberships can be looked at to see in what way businessmen and others were perceived socially since membership in a private club is a privilege granted by the club's existing membership. Clubs do not take those who they do not find acceptable. I have excluded the political clubs in the tables below since most MPs belonged to one or the other depending upon their political leanings. In the list below, clubs designated as Military and University are self explanatory, intellectual and travel include Athenaeum, Travellers, and Erechtheum, social is defined as those social clubs which are not in the upper level social, and the upper level social in this listing are Whites, Brooks's, Boodles, and Alfred.

Table 9
Non-Political Club Memberships by Profession/
Income Category in percentage terms

	Gov't.	Land	Military	Barr.	Solic.	M.D.	Other	Bus.
Clubs:								
Military	3.0	6.8	40.2	1.0	-	-	1.0	0
University	8.5	7.6	2.3	23.4	-	-	19.2	2.5
Intell./travel	22.2	33.3	16.1	19.6	-	-	17.3	8.1
Social	5.1	6.0	6.9	12.1	25	-	12.5	12.5
Upper Level Social	39.3	27.3	23.0	10.3	-	-	16.3	8.8

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1852-1857.]

The table above (Table 9) shows interesting tendencies. Club memberships of those in government and land seem to mirror each other, while memberships of barristers and particularly surprising. At this date many of the government ministers

were still from the landed class. Similarly, barristers and those in the ‘other’ category may represent those with financially based independent means.

Table 10
Non-Political Club Memberships of businessmen disaggregated
By Professions

	Bankers and Finance	Other Business
Clubs:		
Military	-	-
University	0	2.5
Intellectual/travel	12.1	7.1
Social	12.1	12.5
Upper Level Social	9.1	8.7

[Source: Dod’s Parliamentary Companion, 1852-1857.]

Since relatively few businessmen attended Oxford and Cambridge, few businessmen could join the university clubs, thus those who sought membership in a club that was intellectually orientated were likely to join the clubs in the intellectual/travel category. It is amongst those in finance that we see this tendency. The breakout of bankers and finance at 12.1% each in the intellectual/travel category and the social category, and 9.1% in the upper social category begin to approach the percentage of membership in these types of clubs by those who were barristers or are listed as ‘other’ in Table 9. The remainder of the businessmen, after taking out those in banking and finance, are not far behind the percentages of the bankers in memberships in the social and upper social types of clubs, but drop considerably in intellectual/travel club membership, but making up part of this deficit by joining university clubs.

In Table 9, the difference between businessmen’s memberships in clubs and

the memberships of those in government, the landed and the military is immense. Those in government are three times more likely to belong to university clubs, nearly three times more likely to belong to Intellectual/travel clubs, and over four times more likely to belong to upper level social clubs than businessmen. The multiples for the landed as compared to those in business are three times more likely for university clubs, four times more likely for intellectual/travel clubs, and over three times more likely for upper level social. For the military the multiples are just less than one for university clubs, two for intellectual/travel, and just three for upper level social. Since no businessman belonged to a military club and some of those in the government and the landed did, that multiple is infinite. A far larger percentage of those in the military belonged to military clubs than any other category, as one would expect. By the same token, since so many of those in government, the landed and the military belonged to university, intellectual/travel and upper level social clubs, the percentage of membership in the category of social club by those in government, the landed and the military is half that of those in business. Thus, the social milieu in which businessmen mixed, at least as measured by club memberships, seems to be quite different than the milieu of these three other, ancient, categories.

But compared to club memberships of barristers and those in the category of other, business club membership is not quite as different. Many more barristers, and almost as many in the other category, belonged to university and intellectual/ travel oriented clubs than did businessmen, reflecting the greater numbers of barristers and others who had attended university, however, membership in the social category of all

three profession/income groups is practically the same. And, although considerably higher, barrister and other membership of upper level social is much closer to the percentage of businessmen than the previously discussed profession/income groups. The result is that even comparing businessmen to barristers and those in the other category, a group with a number of rentiers, businessmen still come off with fewer club memberships, and with a membership profile which is skewed somewhat differently.

Within the business category itself, between bankers and financiers versus the remainder of the business MPs, there is a slight drift of bankers and financiers toward intellectual/travel and upper level social clubs as compared to their compatriots.

Honors

Honors such as knighthoods, baronetages, peerages, and orders were ways of honoring those who had served the state or nation. We can track the honors given to those who served in this Parliament to see if we can find any pattern.

Table 11
Percentage of those members of different Profession/Income source
in the Parliament of 1852-1857 who received Honors

	Knighthood	Baronetage	Peerage
Businessmen	0	5.0	1.0
Government	10.4	17.9	29.9
Military	13.8	8.0	12.6
Landholding	2.6	12.8	29.9
Barrister	1.9	10.3	3.7
Writers/Journalists	0	0	12.5
Other/Unknown	0	12.4	5.7

[Sources: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1852-1857, The Dictionary of National Biography, Boase's Modern English Biography, Boylan's Dictionary of Irish Biography, the British Biographical Archive: Seventeenth through the Nineteenth Centuries, and the Dictionary of Business Biography.]

As we can see, those who held land or were in the government were the most honored, followed by the military and other/unknown. Business was the least honored category except for solicitors and medical doctors who are not recorded here since they had no honors bestowed upon them at all.

With few businessmen in government, no honors would be expected for service to the government, but seemingly contributions to the nation by businessmen are not yet highly thought of, and not rewarded. If the reform of 1832 represents the business ideal capturing control of the national agenda, and if these honors represent recognition for service to the nation, the rewards bestowed by the nation on business seem to be few after nearly a quarter of a century.

Political Affiliation

The political identities of the business MPs differed significantly from the political identities of the non-business MPs. Only 48 of the business MPs identified themselves as Conservatives, whereas 110 identified themselves as part of the Liberal coalition (The political identities of two business MPs are unknown.) Indeed, the business MPs constituted about 30% of the support of the second and third coalition “Liberal” administrations during the 1852-1857 Parliament. Business MPs were also more likely than non-business MPs to represent borough seats. Hence, 70% of the business MPs held borough seats.

Religious affiliations of House of Commons Members, Parliament of 1852 to 1857

The religious profile of the parliamentarians of 1852-1857 is difficult to determine. Rarely did Members of Parliament list their religious affiliation in Dod’s Parliamentary Companion. But this is not to say that religion was not important. Indeed, by the time of this Parliament, religious issues had convulsed the country for nearly a quarter of a century.

In 1828, the Corporation Act, a piece of Restoration legislation meant to deny public office to non-Church of England members, was repealed, and this was followed in 1829 by the Catholic Relief Act which repealed the Test Act. Thus, by the end of the 1820s, in theory all Christians could take seats in Parliament.²⁷ With non-Anglicans sitting in Parliament, in 1832 Parliament reorganized the Anglican

related Church of Ireland by drastically reducing the number of dioceses and archdioceses from 22 to 12. The fact that this was done by the secular body and not by the church itself spurred an attempt to reconsider the relationship of the Church of England to the secular and political leadership of the United Kingdom and to the other ancient branches of Christianity, Orthodoxy and Catholicism.²⁸ (And, in 1834, there was a decision in the Scottish General Assembly concerning the right to appointments which, when appealed to the Court of Session in Edinburgh, the supreme court of Scotland, led to a broad ruling that was unacceptable to many in the Church. This was another example of the secular intruding itself into the religious and led to the ‘Disruption’ in the Church of Scotland in 1843.)

In reaction to the Irish Church issue, in England, the Oxford Movement, led by Edward B. Pusey, Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford, John Keble, Henry E. Manning, and others, especially including John Henry Newman, and publicized through the Tracts of the Times (1833-1841), attempted to rediscover an autonomous origin for the Church of England and to re-orient the Church toward its Catholic origins as opposed to the Protestant tradition. This caused dissention within the Church of England as many members defended the Protestant orientation of the Church. Within four years of the last of the Tracts, John Henry Newman converted to Roman Catholicism and was followed six years later by Henry E. Manning, who had succeeded Newman in many of his Church of England duties at Oxford.²⁹

Then, in 1850, the Papacy re-established a hierarchy within England consisting of an archbishopric and twelve subsidiary bishoprics, all of which bore

titles derived from British geographic locations. Characterized as the ‘Papal Aggression,’ this re-foundation caused great resentment by Church of England members. The result was the passage of a Bill (Ecclesiastical Titles Act) outlawing the use of existing English diocesan names by non-Church of England hierarchies. This Act was repealed in 1871.³⁰

And, finally, near the end of this Parliament, in 1857, Mathew T. Baines (L. Leeds), Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, became the first dissenter admitted to the Cabinet. Thus, in a little less than a quarter of a century, the formal church-state arrangements wherein in England the Church of England, its communicants and its affiliates, were given preference over dissenters and Roman Catholics in law and position had changed. Roman Catholics were in the House of Commons, a dissenter was in the cabinet, and, further, the state had unilaterally made decisions concerning the organization of Church affiliates in Ireland, and had been dragged into deciding a religious issue in Scotland.

A college for the education of Roman Catholic priests had been established in 1795 at Maynooth in Ireland. Previously, education for the Roman Catholic priesthood in Ireland had taken place in France, but in light of the French Revolution and the fear that seminarians might be tainted with revolutionary ideas, the Irish Parliament decided that it would be less dangerous to train new priests in Ireland rather than have new priests returning from France where they might have been bitten by the revolutionary bug. A few years later, when the Irish Parliament’s powers were united into the Parliament at Westminster (and the Irish secured 105 seats there), the

Maynooth grant was continued at £ 9,000 per year. In 1845 Peel passed a bill increasing the grant to £ 26,000 per year with a £ 30,000 lump sum payment for maintenance and repairs to the buildings.³¹

The above mentioned changes in the British Constitution: opening the qualifications for membership in the House of Commons to non-Church of England Christians, as well as the disputes over church organization in Ireland, the clerical based debates concerning the roots of the Church of England, schism in Scotland, the grants to Roman Catholic educational institutions, and the re-establishment of the Roman hierarchy created a backdrop for this Parliament of religious turmoil and perceived attack upon the Church of England. In the election of 1852, with the re-establishment of the Roman hierarchy as an issue that was discussed, the annual Maynooth grant became a focus upon which those opposed to Rome could concentrate. Many of the parliamentarians in Dod's Parliamentary Companion emphasized their stand on the issue.

And there was one other problem of religious nature. Twice Lionel de Rothschild had been elected to one of the City of London seats in the House of Commons, however twice he could not take his seat because, as a Jew, he was unwilling to use the Christian Bible for the taking of the oath of office, and was unable to use certain words in the oath itself, those words affirming Christianity. Successive governments tried getting these disabilities removed, but the House of Lords was reluctant to accede. The problem of the use of the Bible for the oath-taking was solved by using the Old Testament only, however the issue of the words to

be used in the oath was not resolved until 1858, following the dissolution of this Parliament, when the House of Lords agreed that each of the two Houses of Parliament should determine its own requirements for the oath. Thus the seating of Jewish members also was an issue in the election of 1852.³²

A review of the biographical entries in the first Dod's issue for this new Parliament in 1852 finds that at least 185 of the 658 successful candidates had included positions on the above-mentioned religious issues. This is over 28% of the new and returning members. Positions varied, of course. Mervyn E. Archdall (C. Fermanagh), born in 1812 and educated at Oxford, stated that he was for the "Protestant ascendancy in Ireland",³³ Charles John More (C. Plymouth) wished to uphold the Protestant Church, and Joseph W. Henley (C. Oxfordshire) would "uphold and defend our reformed Protestant institutions in Church and State from all attacks, either at home or abroad."³⁴ Others expressing similar sentiments included: Ed Ball (C. Cambridgeshire), William J. Evelyn (C. Surrey West), Rainald Knightley (C. Northamptonshire South), and Viscount Newark (C. Nottingham South), Edward A. Somerset (C. Monmouthshire), and Henry Tufnell (L. Devonport) who believed that it was necessary to "uphold the Protestant principle as the firmest bulwark of civil and religious liberty."³⁵

Others were more nuanced: Crawshaw Bailey (C. Monmouthshire), an ironmaster in south Wales, pledged to "uphold Church and State, but with perfect freedom to civil and religious liberty,"³⁶ Richard T. Gilpin (C. Bedfordshire) opposed separation of Church and State, but was for religious freedom, Charles

Geach (L. Coventry), a banker, was “attached to the doctrines of the Established Church, but opposed to compulsory payment from one denomination to support another”³⁷ and Sir Fitzroy Kelly (C. Suffolk East) was firmly attached to the Established Church but in favor of civil and religious liberty.

There were those who opposed the Maynooth grant including: Viscount Barrington (C. Berkshire), an Irish Peer, and Viscount Chelsea (C. Dover), son of the third Earl of Cadogan, both of whom had voted for the Maynooth grant in the past but now opposed it, Sir James Buller East, Bt. (C. Winchester) who sought a rescission of the grant, Thomas P. Halsey (C. Hertfordshire) who opposed its continuance, Henry Butler Johnstone (C. Canterbury) who opposed the grant, William Lockhart (C. Lanarkshire) and William Mitchell, M.D., (Whig, Bodmin) who both called for the repeal of the grant, Melville Portal (C. Hampshire) and Peter Rolt (C. Greenwich) who called for no extension or increase in the grant. Some were against endowment of the Roman Catholic Church including John Benbow (C. Dudley), Octavius Duncombe (C. Yorkshire North Riding), Sir DeLacy Evans (L. Westminster), Gilbert Greenall (C. Warrington), Viscount Lewisham (C. Staffordshire South) and Henry Lowther (C. Cumberland), John Masterman (C. London), and Sir Henry B. Meux (C. Hertfordshire) who opposed any further concessions to the Roman Church.

There were those who took the issue and used it to oppose all grants from the public purse. They included: Thomas Barnes (L. Bolton), William E. Baxter (L. Montrose), James Bell (L. Guildford), William Biggs (Rad. Newport, Isle of Wight), Humphrey Brown (L. Tewkesbury), Thomas Challis (L. Finsbury), Joseph Crook

(Rad. Bolton le Moors), William J. Fox (Rad. Oldham), Richard Gardner (Rad. Leicester), Charles Geach (L. Coventry), George Hadfield (L. Sheffield), Alexander Hastie (L. Glasgow), Apsley Pellatt (L. Southwark), Francis Piggott (L. Reading), James Pilkington (L. Blackburn), William P. Price (L. Gloucester City), John A. Roebuck (Reform Sheffield), and William Arthur Wilkinson (L. Lambeth).

There were those who sought an inquiry: H. J. Baillie (C. Inverness), Sir G. H. F. Berkeley (C. Devonport), Sir Edward C. Dering (C. Kent East), Gilbert H. Heathcote (L. Boston), Lord William J. F. Powlett (C. Ludlow), and David Waddington (C. Harwich). Others wished to continue the grant such as Henry Austin Bruce (C. Mertyr Tydvil), Francis Vernon Harcourt (C. Isle of Wight), James Heywood (L. Lancashire) who would continue the grant if paid by Irish rates, and Viscount Monck (L. Portsmouth).

Some members of the House of Commons supported the Roman Catholic Church. William L. Freestun (L. Weymouth), Frederick Lucas (L. Meath), George Bowyer (L. Dundalk) and Stephen DeVere (L. Limerick) were four who did. Lucas had converted to Roman Catholicism from the Society of Friends a number of years before, while DeVere had converted and written on the new hierarchy. Bowyer's book, The Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster and the New Hierarchy, became a well-known work on the issue. Bowyer was honored by the Papacy with a Grand Cross of the Order of St. Gregory the Great and a Grand Collar in the Constantine Order of St. George of Naples.

Those who were opposed to Jewish members in the Parliament included John W. Dod (C. Salop North), William Mundy (C. Derbyshire South), and Loftes Tottenham Wigram (C. Cambridge University). Those who favored seating Jewish members in the House of Commons included William Keough (L. Athlone), P. W. Martin (L. Rochester), and Sir William Molesworth, Bt. (Rad. Southwark).

As we said at the beginning of this section, the religious affiliations are not readily available. However, we may use a proxy to estimate the percentage of the House of Commons that belonged to the Church of England. Until 1871, attendance at Oxford and graduation at Cambridge required accession to the Church of England. The following tables compare the number of Oxford and Cambridge graduates to the number of graduates from other universities. Table 12 shows the raw numbers and table 13 shows the same numbers as percentages of each category. Thus, of the 27 Conservative members of the House of Commons who were involved in the government 22 were Oxford or Cambridge men, which is over 80% of that category.

Table 12
University Attendance by Profession/Income Classification

	Conservative		Liberal		Whig		Repealer		Radical		Reformer	
	Ox & Cam	Non-Ox & Cam	Ox & Cam	Non-Ox & Cam	Ox & Cam	Non-Ox & Cam	Ox & Cam	Non-Ox & Cam	Ox & Cam	Non-Ox & Cam	Ox & Cam	Non-Ox & Cam
Govt.	22	5	23	4	1	2	-	-	-	-	1	1
Land	102	6	26	5	8	-	-	-	1	1	2	-
Military	7	7	1	5	2	2	-	1	-	1	-	-
Barrister	27	16	21	16	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1
Solicitor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Med. Dr.	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Writer/Jour.	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
Other/Unkn.	30	4	11	5	4	1	-	1	-	-	2	-
Business	8	5	8	9	1	-	-	-	1	1	2	1
Totals	198	43	93	44	17	7	-	2	2	3	10	3

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1852-1857.]

Table 13
University Attendance by Profession/Income Classification
Expressed in Percentage Terms

	Conservative		Liberal		Whig		Repealer		Radical		Reformer	
	Ox & Cam	Non-Ox & Cam	Ox & Cam	Non-Ox & Cam	Ox & Cam	Non-Ox & Cam	Ox & Cam	Non-Ox & Cam	Ox & Cam	Non-Ox & Cam	Ox & Cam	Non-Ox & Cam
Govt.	81.5	18.5	85.2	14.8	33.3	66.7	-	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Land	94.4	5.6	83.9	16.1	100	-	-	-	50.0	50.0	100	-
Military	50.0	50.0	16.7	83.3	50.0	50.0	-	100	-	100	-	-
Barrister	64.2	35.8	56.8	43.2	50.0	50.0	-	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Solicitor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Med. Dr.	-	-	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Writer/Jour.	100	-	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100	-
Other/Unkn.	88.2	11.8	68.8	31.2	80.0	20.0	-	100	-	-	100	-
Business	61.5	38.5	47.1	52.9	100	-	-	-	50.0	50.0	66.7	33.3
Totals	82.2	17.8	68.4	31.6	70.8	29.2	-	100	40.0	60.0	76.9	23.1

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1852-1857.]

Ignoring the classifications to the reader's right, which with small numbers leads to invalid percentages, the Conservatives had 82.2% of their university attending membership matriculating to Oxbridge, while the percentage of the Liberals and Whigs are each around 69%, and if one combines all of the Liberal coalition (that is leaving out the Conservatives), one finds 182 university attendees of whom 122 were at Oxford and Cambridge, or 67%. Thus, besides the point that about twenty percent more Conservatives than those of the Liberal coalition attended University, there is about a twenty-three percent greater Oxbridge attendance rate for Conservatives than for Liberals.

If one compares the numbers attending Oxford and Cambridge to those attending other universities, one finds 320 Oxbridge attendees versus 102 at other schools, see chart below:

Table 14
Attendance by 1852-1857 House of Commons members at
Oxford and Cambridge versus other universities

Parties	Universities	
	Oxford and Cambridge	Non-Oxford and Cambridge
Conservative	197	43
Liberal	93	44
Whig	18	7
Repealer	0	2
Radical	2	3
Reformer	10	3
Total	320	102

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1852-1857.]

If one takes this as a rough proxy for the religious sentiments of the members of the House of Commons, it would be safe to say that well over half, and perhaps as many as three quarters of the House of Commons members of this Parliament were congregants of the Church of England, and that Church of England membership by Conservatives was notably higher than for the Liberals and their allies. Since businessmen tended to be concentrated in the Liberal and affiliated parties, it is probable that their religious orientation was much more toward dissenters or others than one would find in the Conservative party.

The Roles and Activities of the Business MPs in the House of Commons, 1852-1857

Business MPs in the Government

The governments of the United Kingdom in the mid-nineteenth century were headed by cabinets composed of members of Parliament who were appointed

ministers of the principal departments of state. These ministers were assisted by junior officers who were also MPs but did not have cabinet rank. The number of ministers of cabinet rank varied somewhat with each government, but it was normally around fourteen or fifteen during the mid-Victorian period, and in the three governments during this Parliament it was thirteen, fifteen, and sixteen. The Prime Minister, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Home Secretary, the Foreign Secretary, the Secretary for War, Secretary for the Colonies, and the Secretary of the Admiralty were the most important ministers in any cabinet and government.

Twenty-nine MPs served as cabinet ministers in the three governments that ruled the United Kingdom between 1852-57. None of these Cabinet members was a businessman. Most were aristocrats. Similarly, of the 35 members who served as junior ministers attached to the cabinet ministers, most derived their income from land. However, there were two businessmen who served as junior ministers during the second and third governments. John Sadlier was a Junior Lord of the Treasury, from 1 January 1853 to 6 March 1854, and James Wilson was Financial Secretary to the Treasury, from 5 January 1853 to the dissolution in 1857.

John Sadlier (1814-1856) was an Irish businessman and politician who had been involved in various financial schemes and who was Chairman of the London and County Joint-Stock Bank. His brother, James, was also an M.P. and had founded the Tipperary Joint Stock Bank. Eventually, John Sadlier and his brother were found to be frauds, and both the Tipperary Bank and another investment, The Royal Swedish Railway Company, went bankrupt when it was discovered that John Sadlier

had overdrawn his account at his brother's bank, the Tipperary, by over £200,000 and had fraudulently issued stock in the railway. John Sadler committed suicide, and his brother fled the country and was expelled from the House of Commons.³⁸

James Wilson (1805-1860) was an English businessman and politician who also had had financial problems earlier in his life when he had speculated in indigo. Wilson, however, had seen to it that all his creditors were paid in full either in cash or by the transfer of assets, including interests in his business, a hattery. Subsequently, he had continued to work for his old hat making company and had continued to study a lifelong interest, economics. Beginning in 1839 he published a series of pamphlets dealing with the effects of the Corn Laws on the community, currency, and trade. Through these publications he made contact with the leadership of the Anti-Corn Law League. A few years later, when he proposed to publish an independent news weekly dedicated to the study of current issues from the viewpoint of political economy, the league offered its support and in August, 1843, Wilson issued the first number of "The Economist: or the Political, Commercial, Agricultural, and Free Trade Journal."³⁹

In 1847 James Wilson stood for Parliament and was elected from Westbury, joining "the Railroad King," George Hudson; George Cornwall Lewis, a friend and contributor to his paper; and Robert Stephenson, another railroad promoter, as freshmen in the Commons. Wilson sat as a Whig who strongly believed in laissez-faire. His competency in financial matters led to his appointment as one of the joint secretaries to the Board of Control in 1848. During the next four years, he opposed

the protectionist tendencies of the sugar interests, supported the repeal of the Navigation Acts, and opposed the Ten Hours Act of 1847, the Health of Towns Act of 1848, and Sir Robert Peel's banking policies.

Five years later, upon the formation of the Aberdeen coalition, Wilson was appointed to the position of Financial Secretary to the Treasury where he worked with Gladstone on the free-trade budget of 1853, particularly on customs issues. The Financial Secretary's responsibilities usually included controlling the details of the government's budget. When Gladstone relinquished the post of Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1855, Wilson's fellow classmate and friend, George Cornwall Lewis, assumed the office and for the next two years relied heavily upon Wilson's experience and knowledge, especially during the financial crisis of 1857.

Below the Cabinet there was a second tier of ministers of lesser departments of state who were also MPs, but did not have Cabinet status. These lesser ministers were also aided by junior ministers who were elected MPs. The number of these non-Cabinet ministers varied, but it was generally around fourteen or fifteen, and in this Parliament's three governments they numbered fourteen, fourteen, and sixteen. Among the more important of these non-Cabinet rank ministers were the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of the Board of Health, the Chief Secretary for Ireland, the Secretary of the Poor Law Board, and the various law officers, especially the Attorney General and the Solicitor General.

Thirty-nine MPs served as non-Cabinet rank ministers in the three governments that ruled during this Parliament. None of these men was a

businessman. Most were landholders and lawyers. Similarly, of the thirty MPs who served as junior ministers to these ministers, most were landholders. However, one railway director, William Monsell, served as a junior minister, being Clerk to the Department of Ordnance, from 13 January 1853 to the dissolution.

William Monsell, (1812-1894) is an example of an M.P. whose business interests may have been merely incidental to his life. He was born in 1812, into a landed Irish family, attended Winchester School and Oxford University, and represented Limerick in Parliament from 1847 to 1874. He served on the board of the Limerick and Waterford Railway. His appointment as Clerk to the Master General of Ordnance was the first in a long line of political appointments over the next twenty years. Eventually, in 1874, he was elevated to the Peerage as Baron Emly.⁴⁰

As the above analysis makes perfectly clear, business MPs played practically no role in the highest levels of the three administrations that governed England between 1852 and 1857. Only two of the sixty cabinet ministers and junior ministers were businessmen. And, only one of the sixty-nine non-cabinet ministers and junior ministers was a businessman and there is some doubt about the extent of his business credentials.

There is, however, another way to look at the roles and activities played by businessmen in the Parliament of 1852-1857, and that is to examine what the business MPs did in the House of Commons. More particularly, we will analyze the activity of businessmen in the House by examining their attendance rates, their speeches, their participation on select committees, and their sponsorship of public and private bills.

Did business MPs engage in these activities at rates below or above what was statistically warranted by their numbers?

Business MPs' Attendance in the House of Commons

How frequently MPs attended and participated in the sessions of the House of Commons, (i.e.. their attendance rates) can be explored by analyzing the "House of Commons Division Lists," which recorded how MPs voted when a division of the House was requested or demanded. During this Parliament there were 923 divisions. A ten percent sample (i.e.. 92 divisions) was analyzed for this study.⁴¹

In our sample of 92 divisions, businessmen, including the seventeen directors, averaged more than 26% of the recorded vote, or 3% more than their percentage in the Parliament. On individual divisions, the range of their participation was from a low of just over 19% to a high of almost 52%. Additionally, if one categorizes the divisions by the number of votes cast (those of 100 or less, 101-200, 201-300, and more than 300), then one finds that businessmen participated regularly and heavily. Of the 14 sample divisions of 100 or fewer votes, nearly 29% of the votes were cast by businessmen; of the 39 divisions of 101-200, just short of 29% were cast by businessmen; of the 24 between 201-300, almost 24% were cast by businessmen; and of the 15 divisions over 300, over 23% were by businessmen. Further, if one looks only at the two categories under 200 votes, (that is 53 divisions out of 92 or 58% of this sample), the average business MP participation in the voting is close to 29% of

the vote, or over 30% more than their percentage in the Commons. Even at the highest category, over 300 votes per division, the percentage of businessmen just exceeds that of their percentage in the House. If we remove the directors from our calculations, the above percentages hold about the same, close to 26% of the recorded vote, or nearly five percent more than their percentage in the House of Commons of 20.5%. The range is from exactly 19% to just short of 52%. Businessmen constituted nearly 29% of divisions of 100 or fewer voting members, 27.67% of divisions of 101-200, over 23% of divisions of 201 to 300, and almost 22.5% of divisions over 300.

What does this mean? If one uses the divisions as a substitute for an attendance record, which across the whole sample I believe is justifiable, then the business MPs attended the sessions of the House far more regularly than the other MPs during normal proceedings, and even when an important vote was scheduled and a large number of MPs voted, a higher percentage of the business MPs did so than was justified by their numbers in the Commons. Finally, almost 30% of the votes cast in the last quarter of each yearly session were cast by businessmen which suggests that businessmen in far greater numbers than their associates stayed at Westminster to the end of each session.

It might be argued that since there was a sizable contingent of the military sitting in this Parliament, that their absence during the Crimean War would skew the results. To check this, the divisions in the sample from the year 1855, the one full year of the war, were analyzed. In only one of the four categories of divisions, that of divisions of 201 to 300 votes, was the average attendance of business members

higher for this year than the average for the whole Parliament. This implies that the war did not greatly influence attendance rates in the Commons.

It is clear from the foregoing analysis that the business MPs attended the sessions of the House regularly and in disproportionately high numbers. Their average attendance rate was 15% greater than their percentage in the House, their attendance rate on days when no important vote was scheduled was over 25% greater than their percentage in the House, and late in the session their attendance rate was over 30% greater than their percentage in the House. If attendance reflects interest, then their interest in the governance of England would seem to have been disproportionately high.

Business MPs' Participation in the Debates in the House of Commons 1852-1857

Another way to analyze the activity of the businessmen in the House of Commons is to examine their speeches in the House of Commons as published in Hansard's Parliamentary Debates.⁴² There are, of course, potential problems with the absolute accuracy of Hansard. Because the transcription was done by hand, the possibility of error arises, and occasionally a quick exchange was missed. Nevertheless, the accuracy seems to be very high and, after all, Hansard is the standard source for what was said in Parliament.

The method used to generate this data on the number of columns spoken by business MPs was elementary bookkeeping. The columns of speeches by the

individual members were measured with a ruler, and the results were entered into a journal, which was divided by year, subdivided by date, and categorized in the left margin by the subject of the debate. The businessmen and front-benchers were then identified, and the totals by subject were calculated. In turn, these results were transferred by subject onto cards color coded by year and cross-referenced to the journal page. Next, the totals for each card were calculated. Then the cards for all of the years were alphabetized, common subjects were consolidated, and grand totals for each subject were tabulated. Finally, the subjects were arranged by categories and subcategories. The result provides a profile of the length at which the businessmen spoke on different subjects.

In the House of Commons of 1852-1857, as represented in Hansard, there were 217,602 column inches of speeches recorded. This is over 3.4 miles! Of this total, businessmen, in the broadest sense, including directors, spoke 40,771 column inches, which is 19% of the time spent in debate. Businessmen in the narrower sense, that is 160 not including directors, spoke 36,095 column inches, which is 16.6% of the debates. However, if one removes those members of the Parliament who were members of the government, as well as the leaders of the opposition, in other words those who had to speak to represent the government or the opposition, one is left with the backbenchers, who usually spoke only when the subject was of importance to them or to their constituents.⁴³ In this Parliament, the backbenchers spoke a total of 125,418 column inches, of which those assigned to businessmen and directors totaled 34,091 inches, or just over 27% of the debate by backbenchers, and to businessmen

without directors 29,414 column inches or approximately 24.5% of the time.

Throughout this thesis, whenever the businessmen's percentage of speeches is given, two numbers usually will be given, the first being the businessmen's percentage of all the speeches in the House of Commons and the second being the backbench business MPs' percentage of all the backbench speeches in the House.

The 217,602 column inches of speeches recorded in the House of Commons between 1852 and 1857 dealt with a bewildering variety of topics. It is possible, however, to group them into fourteen categories and then to rank these categories according to the number of inches of speeches devoted to each. When this is done, one discovers that the most debated category was "government finance" and that the category least debated was "Scottish issues."

With fourteen categories, a fair and proportionate amount of time devoted to a category would be around seven percent of the time. Seven of these fourteen categories were discussed about this amount of time. Three, "government finance," the "military," and "Parliament" itself were disproportionately discussed. Conversely, four categories, "social," "government administration," "local," and "Scottish issues" were discussed less than a fair amount of the time (Table 15).

"Government finance" was always a topic of importance in the House of Commons because the House is where all revenue and expenditure bills must originate under the British Constitution. However, in this Parliament this category was unusually important because much time was devoted to the reform of the customs and domestic duties. "Military" issues were also unusually important in this

Parliament because of the Crimean War and troubles in China. “Parliament” itself was heavily discussed because there were a large number of challenges to elections, reform of election bribery laws, answers to the Queen’s speech, and explanations of ministerial changes. Of the four subjects that were discussed relatively little (i.e., Categories 11-14), there were few topics which command more than 1000 column inches. (For a detailed breakdown see my previous work)⁴⁴

The participation of the business MPs in the debate in the House varied greatly, depending on the topic being debated. In order to determine the subjects most debated by business MPs two tables were created. Table 16 ranks the speeches of all business MPs, while Table 17 ranks the speeches of the backbench business MPs.

The top four subjects of tables 15 and 17 are common to both. They are “business and economics,” “government finance,” “government administration,” and “Scottish issues.” The only difference is in the order for categories two through four.

That the subject “business and economics” would be of prime importance to businessmen is, perhaps, no surprise. The two most important business topics of the day, as measured by the amount of debate they generated, were the continuing controversies over “free trade” and “partnership and limited liability reform.” While the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846 was the single biggest success of the free trade movement, the struggle continued as the opposition to free trade introduced motions to reinstitute the Corn Laws, and argued against the spread of free trade concepts into

other areas of national life. After many fireworks there was no reversal in trend, and free trade principles continued to dominate national policy.

An issue, which was precipitated by a court interpretation of the law, concerned the factory acts. An early act concerning factories had specifically required that the drive shafts between engines and machinery be fenced so that no operator would be injured. Everyone agreed that this was a laudable goal. In the years preceding this Parliament, engineers had taken to putting the drive shafts along the ceiling of the factory to safely remove it from the vicinity of the operators. However, a factory owner was cited for violating the law since the shaft did not have a fence around it. Conflicting decisions from noted jurists as to whether the law should be enforced strictly or not (the final decision being that it should) led to a long discussion in Parliament as to whether this early piece of legislation should be modified. The leading advocate, William Patten, was a conservative with no known profession. He was involved because of a connection with the previously cited factory owner. Businessmen spoke nine percent of the time, barristers twenty-seven percent, Patten alone over twenty-seven percent, and those who were or had been in government over twenty percent of the time. The result was a modification of the legislation giving an arbitrator power to permit variances to the law if appropriate.

Table 15
The Subjects Debated in the House of Commons,
1852-1857

Rank	Category	Number of Column Inches	Percentage
1	Government Finance	48,546	22
2	Military	29,070	13
3	Parliament	19,208	9
4	Education and Culture	17,079	8
5	Religion	15,410	7
6	Business and Economics	14,404	7
7	Empire	14,262	7
8	Irish Issues	13,889	6
9	Foreign Affairs	12,916	6
10	Judicial Issues	12,487	6
11	Social Issues	6,738	3
12	Government Administration	5,467	3
13	Local Issues	4,645	2
14	Scottish Issues	3,481	2
Total		217,602	101*

*Due to rounding, the total of the percent column is greater than 100.

[Source: Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 1852-1857.]

Table 16
Business MPs' Participation in the House of Commons
Debates, 1852-1857

Rank	Category	Total Column Inches of Debate	Total of Businessmen's Speeches	Businessmen's Percent of Debate
1	Business and Economics	14,404	3,777	26
2	Government Administration	5,467	1,432	26
3	Scottish Issues	3,481	839	24
4	Government Finance	48,546	11,654	24
5	Religion	15,410	3,689	24
6	Education and Culture	17,079	3,374	20
7	Empire	14,262	2,440	17
8	Foreign Affairs	12,916	2,127	16
9	Local Issues	4,645	746	16
10	Parliament	19,208	2,999	16
11	Irish Issues	13,889	2,144	15
12	Social Issues	6,738	915	14
13	Judicial	12,487	1,503	12
14	Military	29,070	3,132	11
Total		217,602	40,771	19

[Source: Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 1852-1857.]

Table 17
Backbench Business MPs' Participation in the
House of Commons Debates, 1852-1857

Rank	Category	Total Column Inches of Backbench Debate	Total of Backbench Businessmen's Speeches	Backbench Businessmen's Percent of Backbench Debate
1	Business and Economics	8,935	3,389	38
2	Government Finance	24,742	8,947	36
3	Government Administration	2,792	1,006	36
4	Scottish Issues	2,513	829	33
5	Foreign Affairs	6,544	2,023	30
6	Religion	11,869	3,583	30
7	Parliament	10,922	2,872	26
8	Irish Issues	8,024	2,078	26
9	Empire	9,743	2,191	22
10	Local	2,701	541	20
11	Education and Culture	9,956	1,958	20
12	Military	15,620	2,770	18
13	Judicial	6,589	1,157	18
14	Social Issues	4,468	747	17
Total		125,418	34,091	27

[Source: Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 1852-1857.]

“Partnership and limited liability reform” was another important concern of businessmen. The main problem here involved the limited liability laws. Certain businesses, such as railroads and mining companies, often needed great sums of capital, and would thus issue stock that would trade on the exchanges. However,

stock issued without strong limited liability provisions in the law could haunt the holders of the stock if the company had financial trouble, since under British law creditors of the company could seek compensation from the stockholders, and in some cases this liability could shadow a shareholder for sometime after disposal of the stock. This had the unfortunate effect of making it hard to raise capital, especially for new enterprises. Limited liability could be secured, but it required the passage of a special bill in Parliament, and this was very expensive. Therefore, a strong limited liability law, easily available to any who could qualify, but without the necessity of Parliamentary action, was seen as necessary to ensure the safe and efficient raising of capital. Yet it was feared, with some justification if one remembers the case of the Sadliers, that sharp operators would use the limited liability laws to shield themselves from the effects of their frauds. Thus the issue was a complicated one of economic efficiency versus public protection and it was not completely resolved in this Parliament.

G. R. Searle, in his book, Entrepreneurial Politics in Mid-Victorian Britain, argued that the conflict within the business community was an example of a group being unable or unwilling to take an action that probably would benefit it. Businessmen could not necessarily see their best interests.⁴⁵

In particular, if we look at who spoke in favor, it was the government officials in the Palmerston administration that pushed this idea. Bankers, such as Glyn and Baring were much opposed, fearing limited liability would be a refuge for scoundrels. Over 46% of the debate was by government figures, while businessmen

contributed just over 30%, much of which was against the concept, the bankers alone speaking eleven and one half percent of the time. While a Bill passed, it would take six more years and multiple Bills before the final British regimen of limited liability was created.

Additionally, businessmen spoke often on such other business topics as “assurance associations,” “bills of exchange,” “coinage,” “railways,” and “banking,” but relatively little on the “importation of guano” and “hardware manufacturing.”

Businessmen in this Parliament were also extremely interested in government financial matters. More attention was given to “government finance” in this House of Commons than to any other subject, and businessmen were disproportionately involved in these debates. In particular, they were especially active in the discussion of “customs duties,” “consumption duties,” “carriage duties,” “stamp duties,” and “national debt issues.” Concerning “customs duties,” which provided the largest single source of funds for the government at over 34% of the revenue, businessmen spoke over 55% and 59% respectively concerning such matters as lower duties and Custom’s House management. Since business directly paid these taxes, businessmen were deeply interested in them. “Consumption duties” included such subjects as “spirit duties” where they spoke only 5% and 7% of the time, “malts and hops” about which they gave 16% and 30% of the speeches, and “wine duties” on which 84% and 99% of the debate was by businessmen. On this topic one businessman, Benjamin Oliveria, spoke more than 75% of the time. Across the board, on all consumption duties, businessmen spoke over 36% of the time.

“Carriage duties,” on which they spoke 31% and 49% of the time, are an interesting topic. This luxury duty had been imposed during the Napoleonic Wars to raise revenue from the “rich,” who owned stables and carriages. Some fifty years later, in a classic example of unintended consequence, this duty was found to be a heavy burden on the middle classes since it raised the cost of public stage coach travel, which was having to compete with railroads, and it was a burden for the local hackney and rental carriage trade, which performed the useful service of carrying people to and from railroad stations and other destinations in the cities.

The “advertising stamps” and “newspaper stamps” were heavily discussed by the businessmen because of their strong opposition to this form of taxation. In Gladstone’s budget of 1853, “advertising stamp duties” were to be a tax of one shilling six pence per advertisement placed in a newspaper, down from the previous level of three shillings. In spite of this tax decrease, this duty was the subject of an intense attack which was led by Milner Gibson, the president of the Association for the Repeal of Taxes on Knowledge. During the debate on this topic, businessmen spoke 38% and 67% of the time. Over the opposition of the government, the House passed a resolution by a vote of 200 to 169 that the advertising duties should be abolished. The Chancellor of the Exchequer complied.

Businessmen MPs were not as immediately successful, however, in eliminating the stamp duty on newspapers. This matter involved two other issues. The first was the revenue of the postal service, which carried newspapers printed on stamped paper but refused those that weren’t so imprinted. If the “newspaper stamp

duty” had been eliminated, a new method of revenue collection for the Post would have been needed. The second issue that interfered with this reform was the rivalry between the metropolitan newspapers and the provincial press, which feared that the elimination of the duty would enable the metropolitan papers to expand their distribution across the whole of the realm. This produced over 3000 inches of debate during which the businessmen spoke 27% and 41 % of the time. While they lost by the narrow margin of four votes on a motion to eliminate this tax in 1854, the government abolished it in the subsequent budget.

Another “government finance” issue was the management of the government’s debt, which was discussed 23% and 50% of the time by businessmen. Included in this debate were the “South Seas” and other government annuities, the “consolidated fund,” and “exchequer bills.” Finally, concerning “expenditures,” businessmen spoke 23% and 35% of the time, including the army and navy estimates on which they spoke 22% and 24% and 13% and 25% of the time. Of all the military issues, army and navy expenditure was what businessmen spoke about most often.

The urgency of reform in “government administration” became apparent during the Crimean War when the scandalous incompetence of the military bureaucracy in supplying proper equipment and medical facilities for the troops caused much illness and death. This led to calls for reform of the War department and this opening was used by John Roebuck, M.P. for Sheffield and chairman of the Administrative Reform Association, to propose additional extensive governmental

administration reform. Businessmen actively participated in this discussion because the business aspects of running a government were not lost upon them, and government administration was dependent upon government finance. Businessmen understood, perhaps better than others, that inefficiency in government leads to either higher taxes or debt financing, neither of which was acceptable at the time.

Last, “Scottish issues” were important to businessmen since a substantial number of Scottish seats were held by businessmen. The most important topics to them were “reformatory schools,” “Edinburgh taxation,” and “education.”

Of the four subjects least discussed by businessmen in Tables 16 and 17, three are common to both. They are the “military,” “judicial,” and “social” categories. Two other subjects, “education and culture” and “Irish issues” appear on just one of these two tables as a least discussed subject.

Under the heading of “education and culture” more than one-third of the over 17,000 column inches of debate devoted to this category concerned one topic, the “reform of Oxford and Cambridge.” Businessmen participated very little in this discussion, probably because so few of them had attended either Oxford or Cambridge. However, they did participate heavily in the debate on the other universities, which they were more likely to have attended. Further, they actively discussed the topics of “primary education,” and “libraries and museums.”

Of the fourteen topics under the heading of “social,” there were only two, “friendly societies” and “marriage issues,” which had a significant amount of debate by businessmen as a percentage of all members. However as a percentage

of the backbenchers, businessmen also heavily discussed “graveyards” and “charities.”

There is a simple explanation why the subjects “military,” “judicial,” and “Irish issues” had little participation by businessmen: all three of these subjects were especially important to other groups of MPs. Ireland had 105 seats reserved for it in the Commons, and there were over one hundred lawyers and over one hundred active or retired members of the military in the House. It was these representatives who heavily discussed these subjects, not businessmen. However, as previously noted, businessmen did feel free to discuss the financing of the military. Also, “minister’s money” (a tax against Roman Catholics in certain towns to support Protestant ministers) in Ireland was an important point of discussion to them, on which they spoke 43% and 61 % of the time.

The interest of business MPs in financial questions is a consistent theme. Besides their deep involvement in the subject of “government finance,” businessmen approached many of the remaining categories from a financial perspective. For instance, the major topic under the subject of “empire” was “India,” and the sub-topic “Indian finance” was particularly interesting to business MPs. Hence business MPs ended up speaking 24% and 24% of the time devoted to “Indian finance.” Under the category of “religion” was the topic “Anglican communion.” On this topic businessmen spoke frequently about such financial issues as “church rates,” “the union of benefices and transfer of funds at the Carlisle canonries,” and “ecclesiastical revenue.” On these three issues business MPs’ percentage of the speeches were 37%

and 41%, and for all Anglican financial issues, including “ecclesiastical property,” they spoke 23% and 28% of the time.

Regarding the Roman Catholic Church, the major topic of discussion was the government’s financial support of the college of Maynooth, a seminary for Catholic priests in Ireland. As discussed above, in 1850 the Pope had shocked the English by proclaiming the reestablishment of a formal hierarchy for the Roman Catholic Church in England. Titles incorporating English geographic names were created such as the Archbishop of Westminster. Many Protestants were upset by this action, and attacked the Maynooth grant as a way of attacking Roman Catholicism. Many business MPs were strong Protestants and were consequently critical of Catholicism and Maynooth. Hence it is not surprising that businessmen spoke 44% and 52% of the time devoted to Maynooth. Under the categories of “empire” and “foreign affairs” are other topics that had a religious aspect, such as the discussions about the religious persecutions of Protestants in Malta, Spain and Tuscany, as well as Irish religious issues (where the defense of the Irish Established [Protestant] Church on an overwhelmingly Catholic isle was a significant problem). Altogether, these add another 1115 inches of debate in which businessmen spoke 41% and 44% of the time.

Another theme of business interest might come under a heading of “morality.” Such issues as the “aggravated assaults bill,” “death sentences,” “reformatory schools,” the “alleged corruption of Irish members,” and “slavery” were topics that one might consider to have strong moral overtones, and on these

topics business MPs spoke 41 % and 50% of the time.

The major “foreign affairs” crisis of this time was the conflict between Russia and Turkey. Under the category of “foreign affairs,” the topics “Russia” and “Turkey” were frequently debated by businessmen, notably Bright and Cobden, and their arguments often stemmed from moral and religious positions. Both Bright and Cobden opposed the growing confrontation with Russia because they believed war was generally immoral. Further, they argued that the underlying reasons for the war with Russia were religious. Cobden believed that the Crimean war stemmed from a dispute over which church, Orthodox or Catholic, had greater standing in Jerusalem.

The concentration of businessmen’s speeches on business and moral issues is strikingly demonstrated by the fact that the four areas, “government finance,” “business and economics,” “religion,” and those additional topics which have a “moral overtone,” made up over 52% of businessmen’s speeches in Commons but totaled less than 40% of all of the discussion in the House. The other 48% of the businessmen’s speeches were scattered throughout the remaining categories and topics.⁴⁶ Clearly what concerned business MPs most were business issues and, somewhat more surprisingly, moral/religious issues. This latter concern probably was due to the fact that a disproportionate percentage of businessmen MPs were either strong evangelical Anglicans or Nonconformists.

Thus it can be safely said that while businessmen actively participated in, and made important and significant contributions to, the debates in the House of

Commons, even going so far as to change the direction of government policy in a few instances, their interest was not uniformly spread across all of the subjects discussed in this Parliament. Generally the interest of business MPs seems to have been limited to the subjects of business and financial matters and to those areas in other subjects that directly affected business, or had an impact upon the businessmen's moral or religious values and prejudices.

Business MPs' Participation on House of Commons Committees

A third method of analyzing business MPs participation in this Parliament is by examining their participation on Parliamentary Committees. Parliamentary systems transact a great deal of their business through committees that debate details and propose amendments. Other than a few standing committees, such as the Committee on Private Bills (which directed private bills to select committees), and the Committee of the Whole (which was a committee of the whole House), most legislation or questions were referred to select committees composed of a small number of members who usually had special knowledge or interest in the subject and who were chosen from all parties.

There were two types of select committee, those for public bills or issues and those for private bills. The members of the select committees for public bills were named in the sessional papers, but the members of the select committees for private bills were not, and hence have not been analyzed. In the almost five years of this

Parliament there were 155 select committees on public bills or issues and on these committees sat 1,724 MPs, of whom 358 (or 20.8%) were businessmen.⁴⁷

The 155 select committees on public bills and issues investigated a wide range of issues. The largest subject category - using the same fourteen categories employed in analyzing the speeches - was "Parliament." Of the 155 select committees, 73 (or 47%) dealt with "Parliament." At the other extreme, there were no select committees on "Scottish issues" (Table 18).

The reason there were so many committees dealing with "Parliament" is that fifty-six of these committees dealt with petitions challenging the seating of a Member. Most of these petitions alleged election violations, such as bribery. A reason for the high number of such challenges, beyond a possible growing sense of disapproval of such electoral behavior, is that in this Parliament, with its majorities formed by alliances among the various factions, the change in the representation of a few seats might have had a significant impact on government majorities.

The participation of business MPs on these 155 select committees varied considerably, depending on the subject (Table 19). In the five categories at the top of Table 19: "local," "foreign affairs," "government finance," "business and economics," and "education and culture," the percent of businessmen on the committees exceeded the percent of businessmen in the House of Commons. On the other hand, the four categories in which businessmen participated least were "Irish issues," "judicial," "religion," and "military." The range of business M.P. participation on committees was great, with business MPs forming 35% of the

members of the “local” select committees, but only 10% of the members of the “military” and “religion” select committees.

Under the category “local” were committees that dealt mainly with London, and, in particular, with bridges, roads, and construction. Six of the eight “local” committees dealt with these “construction” topics. Businessmen exceeded their percentage in the House on five of these committees.

Table 18
The Subjects Investigated by the Select Committees
of the House of Commons, 1852-1857

Rank	Category	Number of Committees	Percentage
1	Parliament	73	47
2	Business and Economics	16	10
3	Military	12	8
4	Social	9	6
5	Government Administration	9	6
6	Local	8	5
7	Judiciary	8	5
8	Irish Issues	6	4
9	Government Finance	4	3
10	Foreign Affairs	4	3
11	Empire	2	1
12	Education and Culture	2	1
13	Religion	2	1
14	Scottish Issues	0	0
Total		155	100

[Source: British Sessional Papers, Parliament of 1852-1857.]

Because there was a strong business component in the construction and engineering trades, and because a sizable number of business MPs lived in the metropolis, it is understandable that a large number of the “local” committee members would be from the ranks of the business MPs. There were two other “local” committees, one dealing with St. James Park and one with the Thames Marshes. Businessmen were also well represented on these committees.

It may seem a bit unusual that businessmen would be so involved in “foreign affairs” committees, but again the subjects that these committees dealt with had characteristics we have seen before, business and morality. Of the four “foreign affairs” committees, three had strong business overtones (two concerned financial claims by foreign businessmen against Great Britain, and one concerned a tariff imposed on ships passing through the Danish waters off Copenhagen), and the fourth dealt with the slave trade, a subject that had, both strong moral and business overtones. Businessmen composed twenty percent of the members of the committee on tariffs, and forty percent or more of the members of the three other committees.

“Government finance” has the next largest percentage of business MP participation. Businessmen were over-represented on all four of these committees, including two on “public monies,” one on “metropolitan coal duties,” and one on “Liverpool’s shipping charges.” Further, on the committees dealing with “business and economics,” businessmen were, as one would expect, very prominent. Businessmen exceeded their percentage in the House on nine committees in the “business and economics” category, including those dealing with such topics as

“payment of wages,” “silver and gold wares,” “bills of exchange and promissory notes,” “decimal coinage,” “adulteration of food,” and “assurance associations.”

Table 19
Business MPs’ Participation on House of Commons
Select Committees, 1852-1857

Rank	Category	Total Number of MPs	Total Number of Business MPs	Percentage
1	Local	110	39	35
2	Foreign Affairs	54	19	33
3	Government Finance	61	20	33
4	Business and Economics	256	72	28
5	Education and Culture	32	9	28
6	Empire	42	9	21
7	Social	152	30	20
8	Government Administration	149	28	19
9	Parliament	479	86	18
10	Irish Issues	92	14	15
11	Judiciary	105	13	13
12	Religion	29	3	10
13	Military	163	16	10
14	Scottish Issues	0	0	0
Total		1,724	358	21

[Source: British Sessional Papers, Parliament of 1852-1857.]

There was one “business and economics” committee on which businessmen approximated their percentage in the House, and they were under-represented on six “business and economics” committees including two on “mines,” and one each on “unions,” “loan societies,” “railways,” and another on “assurance associations.”

Finally there were the two committees in the category of “education and

culture.” On one of these committees, concerning “national education,” businessmen exceeded their percentage in the Commons, and on the other committee, regarding the “National Gallery,” they were fairly represented. Because of their commitment to the self-improvement ethic and because the education of the work force has an impact on business, it is understandable that businessmen would be interested in educational issues. At the other end of the list of categories (but ignoring the category “Scottish issues” which had no committees), are the four categories of committees on which businessmen were least represented, “military,” “judicial,” “Irish issues”, and “religion.” Three of these categories, “military,” “judicial,” and “Irish issues” are categories in which we have already seen that business MPs were under-represented in other functions of the House of Commons. As previously noted in the section on speeches, these were subjects in which a large number of other MPs were interested because of either occupation or constituency. Two of the twelve committees listed under the heading “military,” one concerning an “arctic expedition” and the second involving “appointments in naval dockyards,” had a representative number of businessmen. On only one of the eight committees on the “Judiciary” were they adequately represented. And on only two of the six committees dealing with “Irish” Issues, one involving “Waterford Postal arrangements” (a topic having some business implications), and one involving a “Times article detailing bribery at Irish elections,” did businessmen approximate their percentage in the House.

There were two committees dealing with Anglican Church Issues listed under the category of “religion.” Businessmen were sparse on both committees,

being two of fifteen on a committee involving the “Ecclesiastical Commission,” and one of fourteen on a committee concerning “parish formation.” With a disproportionate number of businessmen being religious dissenters, it is understandable that few businessmen would be appointed to committees in this category.

The committees in the “empire” and “social” categories had business representation that was about in line with their percentage in the House of Commons. Under the category “empire” were two committees, the first of which dealt with the East India Company charter renewal. Nine of thirty-seven members of this committee were businessmen. The other committee dealt with an appointment in Australia and had no business members.

The “social” category (number seven) had nine committees. Businessmen were over-represented on two of these, both concerning public housing. On three other committees they were fairly represented and on four committees they were under-represented.

The aggregate percentage of business members on the committees of the two remaining categories was less than the representative percentage of businessmen in Parliament. But one of these categories, “government administration,” had close to a fair representation with approximately 19% participation by businessmen. Businessmen exceeded their representation in the Commons on three committees of this category, two of which concerned contracting with the government, and one of which involved the use of railways for the transportation of mail. Both of these topics

would be of interest to businessmen. On another committee, concerning civil service estimates, business was fairly represented, while on five committees businessmen were under-represented.

The remaining category is “Parliament” itself. As previously noted, it had the largest number of committees at seventy-three, of which fifty-six dealt with elections to seats in the House. Businessmen were over represented on eight of these election committees, fairly represented on twenty-eight, under represented on one, and had no members on nineteen. Of the remaining seventeen committees on Parliamentary issues, businessmen exceeded their proportional share on only three, all involving the printing of Parliamentary papers by contract with commercial printers. There were seven committees on which businessmen approximated their percentage in the House and seven committees on which they were under represented.

Several conclusions can be drawn from the above analysis. First, businessmen were usually well represented on committees in the business category, as well as on committees in other categories where there was a significant business component. They were over represented, for instance, on the Parliamentary printing committees (i.e.. category 9, “Parliament”) and on government contracts committees (i.e.. category 8, “government administration”). Further, their frequent membership on “government finance” committees reinforces their previously noted interest in this subject. Conversely, they were often under represented on committees dealing with subjects which had other representation in this Parliament, such as the “military,” “judiciary,” and the “Irish.” Finally, they were surprisingly heavily represented on

committees dealing with “London” issues, “educational and cultural” issues, and “foreign affairs.”

Occasionally, businessmen also testified before select committees. Of the 1738 witnesses who testified before the 155 committees, 356 or over 20% were businessmen (Table 20).⁴⁸ The categories in which businessmen were a large percent of the witnesses included “foreign affairs,” “government finance,” “business and economics,” “government administration,” and “local.” Four of these five categories (“foreign affairs,” “government finance,” “business and economics,” and “local”) were also among the top five categories in which businessmen MPs were most heavily represented (Table 19). This is the recurring pattern. On almost all of the select committees before which businessmen were called as witnesses, the percentage of business MPs serving on that committee exceeded their percentage in the House. Conversely, two of the four categories that had the least business testimony, “judiciary” and “religion,” were also categories which had little or no participation by business MPs.

Hence it appears that business MPs tended to be appointed to committees related to business issues, and that these businessmen, in turn, often sought the testimony of other businessmen. Conversely, businessmen were not as likely to be called before committees on which there were few or no businessmen MPs.

Table 20
Businessmen as Witnesses before the House of Commons
Select Committees, 1852-1857

Rank	Category	Total Number of Witnesses	Total Number of Business Witnesses	Percentage
1	Foreign Affairs	42	21	50
2	Government Finance	65	30	46
3	Business and Economics	423	135	32
4	Government Administration	114	28	25
5	Local	150	23	6
6	Parliament*	46	8	17
7	Irish Issues	120	18	15
8	Social	289	42	15
9	Military	208	25	12
10	Empire	78	8	10
11	Education and Culture	76	6	8
12	Religion	31	0	0
13	Judiciary	99	0	0
14	Scottish Issues	0	0	0
Total		1,738	356	20

*Does not include election committee witnesses.

[Source: British Sessional Papers, Parliament of 1852-1857.]

Business MPs' Introduction of Legislation

The last method of analyzing the involvement of business MPs in the House of Commons of 1852-1857 is to look at the legislation they introduced. There were three categories of bills: public bills (which concerned national government policy), local and private bills (which affected either local governments or businesses), and

personal bills (which involved individuals and concerned such matters as estates, divorce, and adoption). Because this last group usually originated in the House of Lords and had no House of Commons' sponsors listed, we will look only at the first two types, the public bills and the local and private bills.⁴⁹

Between 1852 and 1857, 721 public bills were introduced in the House of Commons. They dealt with virtually every aspect of British life. The largest subject category - again using the same fourteen categories employed in analyzing the speeches and select committees - was "Irish issues". Of the 721 Public Bills, 127 (18%) dealt with the United Kingdom's other large isle. At the other extreme, only eight bills (1%) fell into the "foreign affairs" category (Table 21).

These 721 public bills had 1,729 sponsors of whom 271 (16%) were business MPs including directors. If we eliminate directors, the number only drops to 264, losing two from Business and Economics, two from Scottish Issues, two from Judiciary, and one from Military issues. Business MPs were most likely to sponsor bills dealing with "government finance" (category 1) and were least likely to sponsor bills dealing with the "military" and "local" (categories 13 and 14 of Table 22).

Three of the top five categories in Table 22 are our usual suspects, "government finance," "government administration," and "business and economics." The two other categories in the top five, "education and culture" and "Scottish issues" have also appeared regularly among the categories most popular with businessmen. It would be redundant to enumerate the various reasons for businessmen's interest in these subjects.

However, analysis of these top 5 categories reveals some interesting trends. For instance, James Wilson, as Financial Secretary to the Treasury, was quite involved in category 1, “government finance.” Sixty-five bills concerning “government finance” were introduced into the House of Commons during this Parliament, and Wilson was a sponsor of fifty-four of them. Further, these fifty-four bills were 91% of the fifty-nine bills sponsored by businessmen.

Analogously, of the thirty-three sponsors of legislation concerning category 2, “government administration,” thirty-two were in the government, and Wilson was one of these sponsors ten times. He was a sponsor on four bills concerning the Publics Works Act, three concerning the Cinque Ports, two involving the consolidation or closing of certain government offices, and one concerning civil service retirement.

Business MPs were also exceptionally active in category 2, “business and economics.” They account for eleven of twenty-nine sponsors of legislation concerning banking and finance, as well as six of eight sponsors of legislation concerning bills of lading, four of nine concerning assurance, four of ten concerning wages, and two of five concerning silver and gold wares. Business MPs also sponsored bills on such other topics as laboring hours for women and children, horses for hire, and railways and canals at rates close to their percent in the House of Commons. But on one topic, highways, only one of eight sponsors was a business M.P.

Table 21

The Subjects of the Public Bills Introduced Into the
House of Commons, 1852-1857

Rank	Category	Number of Public Bills	Percentage
1	Irish Issues	127	18
2	Business and Economics	108	14
3	Social	87	12
4	Judiciary	69	10
5	Government Finance	65	9
6	Scottish Issues	55	8
7	Religion	53	7
8	Military	35	5
9	Local	31	4
10	Parliament	27	4
11	Education and Culture	26	4
12	Empire	14	2
13	Government Administration	14	2
14	Foreign Affairs	8	1
Total		721	100

[Source: British Sessional Papers, Parliament of 1852-1857.]

Table 22

The Businessmen MPs' Sponsorship of Public Bills in the
House of Commons, 1852-1857

Rank	Category	Total Number of Sponsors	Number of Business Sponsors	Percentage
1	Government Finance	183	59	32
2	Government Administration	33	10	30
3	Education and Culture	69	20	29
4	Business and Economics	267	59	22
5	Scottish Issues	131	26	20
6	Empire	32	4	13
7	Social	196	22	11
8	Religion	117	13	11
9	Foreign Affairs	19	2	11
10	Judiciary	165	1	10
11	Parliament	73	7	10
12	Irish Issues	297	27	9
13	Local	68	3	4
14	Military	75	3	
Total		1,729	271	16

[Source: British Sessional Papers, Parliament of 1852-1857.]

There were eleven topics under category 3, “education and culture.” On four of these, most notably on Oxford and Cambridge, reformatory schools, and the education of pauper children, businessmen did not sponsor legislation. But on six topics they did sponsor bills. Their most active sponsorship was of eight bills concerning public libraries and museums, literary and scientific societies, the National Gallery, and non-”Oxbridge” universities.

Category 5, “Scottish issues,” covered fifty-five bills. Businessmen sponsored eighteen of these, covering twelve distinct issues. On three subjects, Scottish reformatory schools, procedures in Sheriffs courts, and Scottish joint-stock banks, business MPs sponsored more than one bill over the course of this Parliament.

At the other end of Table 22 are the least popular categories for businessmen, and again we find the “military,” “Irish” issues, and “judicial” (i.e., categories 10, 12, and 14). Again there is no reason to reiterate the reasons for this unpopularity. However, interestingly, two other categories, “local” (category 13), and “Parliament” (category 11), also show little business activity. Why?

Businessmen dealt with many local issues through the “Local and Private Bills” route, as we shall see below. As for the category of “Parliament,” two-thirds of these bills were sponsored by members of the government, and the only businessman in the government who sponsored any was Wilson, and he only sponsored two. Most of these bills concerned election violations, changes in election laws, and procedures of the House.

As previously mentioned, businessmen constituted only 16 percent of the sponsors of Public Bills. Why was this figure so low? If one remembers that most of the public legislation came from, and was sponsored by, cabinet and sub-cabinet ministers and their junior ministers, few of whom were businessmen, this low figure is perfectly understandable. But businessmen appeared as one of the sponsors (there always being more than one sponsor) of 34 percent (242 of 721) of the public bills introduced, and of 35 percent (171 of 492) of the public bills passed. Why the

discrepancy between these statistics and the fact that businessmen constituted only 16 percent of the sponsors of public bills? About 30 percent of the “liberal” faction from which the government drew its strength between 1853 and 1857 was composed of the 118 businessmen who described themselves as “Liberals,” “Whigs,” “Radicals,” or “Repealers.” The government probably thought it wise to seek some business support on a sizable fraction of its legislation.

Between 1852 and 1857 the House of Commons also dealt with 783 “Local and Private Bills.” Most of these bills were concerned with business enterprises (especially railroads and utilities), and municipal issues. Businessmen, not surprisingly, were quite active in sponsoring this type of legislation. These 783 bills were sponsored by 1,729 MPs of whom 597 (35%) were businessmen. Further, businessmen were listed as at least one of the sponsors on 437 (or 56%) of these 783 Bills and were at least one of the sponsors of 245 (or 54%) of the 454 bills that passed the House of Commons (Table 23).

Finally, each of the “Local and Private Bills” had not only sponsors, but also a presenter, the M.P. who read the bill upon its introduction in the House. As Chairman of the Committee on Private Bills, Joseph Brotherton, a retired cotton and silk manufacturer, had the duty of presenting 531 (or 82%) of the 646 private bills introduced up to 1856. After that year no presenter is listed.

Table 23

The Business MPs' Sponsorship of Local and Private Bills
In the House of Commons, 1852-1857

Rank	Category	Total Number of Local and Private Bills	Total Number of Sponsors of Bills	Number of Business Sponsors	Percentage
1	Railway	317	700	245	35
2	Local Utilities	142	313	128	41
3	Other Companies	45	97	46	47
4	Municipal	95	217	86	40
5	Other	184	402	92	23
Total		783	1,729	597	35

[Source: British Sessional Papers, Parliament of 1852-1857.]

Summary

In order to determine the relative importance to businessmen of the fourteen subject categories used in the analyses of “speeches,” “select committees,” and “public bills,” two tables have been created. The first, Table 24, is a summary of the rankings of the businessmen’s participation in these three activities. By ranking the subjects of the speeches by the percentage of the businessmen’s participation from most to least, the subjects of the committees by businessmen’s percentage of the membership on committees from most to least, and businessmen’s percentage of the sponsorship of public bills from most to least, relationships among these different subjects may be determined.

If the rankings of each of the subject categories in these three columns are added together creating a raw score, and then the scores are listed in order, a ranking

of the relative importance of each of these subjects is generated. For example, “government finance” is listed as the fourth most popular subject of businessmen’s speeches, the third most important category for businessmen to be members of committees, and the most important subject for businessmen on the list of public bill sponsorship, resulting in a score of 8 (Table 25). If we then rank these categories from lowest number to highest, the lower the score, the more important the topic was to businessmen.

The top four subjects on Table 25, are “government finance” (raw score 8, rank 1), “business and economics” (raw score 9, rank 2), “government administration” (raw score 12, rank 3), and “education and culture” (raw score 15, rank 4). These are the subject areas in which businessmen were clearly most interested. Conversely, “military” (raw score 39, rank 14), “judicial” (raw score 35, rank 13), and “Irish issues” (raw score 33, rank 12) were of the least importance to businessmen. The remaining subjects fell somewhere in the middle.

Table 24
The Ranking of Business MP Participation by Subject Categories – In
Speeches, Select Committees' Membership and Sponsorship of
Public Bills in the House of Commons, 1852-1857

Rank	The Subjects Most Likely to be Debated by Business MPs	The Subjects of Select Committees on which Business MPs Most Likely Served	The Subjects Most Likely to be Legislated About by Business MPs
1	Business and Economy	Local	Government Finance
2	Government Administration	Foreign Affairs	Government Administration
3	Scottish Issues	Government Finance	Education and Culture
4	Government Finance	Business and Economy	Business and Economic
5	Religion	Empire	Scottish Issues
6	Education and Culture	Education and Culture	Empire
7	Empire	Social	Social
8	Foreign Affairs	Government Administration	Religion
9	Local	Parliament	Foreign Affairs
10	Parliament	Irish Issues	Parliament
11	Irish Issues	Judiciary	Judiciary
12	Social	Military	Irish Issues
13	Judiciary	Religion	Military
14	Military	Scottish Issues	Local

Table 25
The Ranking of Subject Categories by Business MPs’
Participation With Raw Scores

Rank	Category	Raw Score
1	Government Finance	8
2	Business and Economy	9
3	Government Administration	12
4	Education and Culture	15
5	Empire	18
6	Foreign Affairs	18
7	Scottish Issues	23
8	Local	24
9	Religion (tie)	26
9	Social (tie)	26
11	Parliament	29
12	Irish Issues	33
13	Judiciary	35
14	Military	39

These results confirm our previous analysis. Throughout this thesis businessmen’s concern for the first three issues has been apparent. Because the customs duties paid for much of the government, and because these tariffs directly affected business, businessmen’s interest in “government finance” was to be expected. Wilson, as Financial Secretary to the Treasury, was quite involved in this category, and one might be tempted to argue that the considerable interest by business MPs in this category was merely a reflection of Wilson’s position. Although Wilson

was very active in the introduction of “government finance” bills, the high activity of businessmen in this category cannot be laid solely at his feet. While it is true that over 22% of the speeches by business MPs on “government finance” were by Wilson, it is also the case that the backbench businessmen spoke 36% of the time that backbenchers debated on the topic. Furthermore, there were four select committees dealing with “government finance” on which nineteen business MPs sat, and Wilson occupied only two of these seats. Wilson was not responsible for the great interest and involvement by businessmen in this category; rather, Wilson was interested in these issues because all business MPs had great interest in these issues.

The only thing surprising about the importance of “business and economics” (rank 2) to businessmen is that it isn’t ranked ahead of “government finance.” It is clear from the foregoing analysis that some of the involvement by businessmen in “government administration” (rank 3) was a result of Wilson acting in his capacity as Financial Secretary. He was the main reason, for instance, for the high rating of business MPs in the “government administration” category of bill sponsorship. But he was not the only businessman interested in this category. For example, ninety-eight percent of the 567 column inches of speeches by business MPs on the topic of “general administration” was given by backbench business MPs. This suggests that backbench businessmen were greatly interested in this topic.

It is somewhat surprising that “education and culture” (rank 4) is as high on Table 25 as it is. Businessmen were interested in education and culture because the mid-Victorian business ethic emphasized the doctrine of “self help” according to

which the rising classes of society could and should improve their station in life by hard work and education. Business MPs were especially active on the committees and in the sponsorship of bills in this category. Hence, they comprised a third of the committees on education, and were sponsors on 16 of 26 bills in this category. They were especially interested in bills dealing with libraries, museums, and national education.

The three categories which had the least business participation, “military” (rank 14), “judicial” (rank 13), and “Irish issues” (rank 12) consistently had little interest shown in them by businessmen. The “military” category, with a score of thirty-nine out of forty-two, was about as unpopular among businessmen as is possible, but “Judicial” and “Irish Issues” were not far be

Conclusion

The businessmen MPs in the House of Commons in the mid-nineteenth century were neither “key players” nor “mere spectators.” They were not key players because they constituted only 2% (3 of 133) of the ministers and junior ministers who ran the three governments of the 1852-1857 Parliament, and at that, only one, Wilson, was involved in policy. On the other hand, the businessmen MPs were also not mere spectators.

The business MPs actively participated in the daily functions of the House of Commons. Although in the narrowest sense they constituted 20.5% of the House of Commons, and in the broadest sense including directors they constituted only 23% of the House, they constituted between 24% and 26% of the attending members on an average day. They also accounted for between 16% and 19% of the total debate and 24% and 27% of the backbench debate. Further, they composed between 19% and 21% of the members of the select committees and sponsored 32% of the public bills and 56% of the local and private bills.

The business MPs were not, however, drawn equally to all of the multivarious subjects taken up by the House of Commons. They tended to concentrate their attention on the subjects which had some connection to business such as “business and economics,” “government finance,” and “government administration.” Conversely, they tended to avoid those subjects having little to do with business such as “judicial,” “military,” and “Irish issues.”

But why did the business MPs restrict their activities to subjects related to

business, and why did so few businessmen obtain ministerial or junior ministerial rank? Business MPs probably concentrated on “business” topics because this was the area they knew best and about which they were most comfortable. Most business MPs were businessmen first and politicians second.

Similarly, few business MPs obtained cabinet or sub-cabinet office because few would have grown up with that objective in mind. Without the goal of government office or service from youth, proper education and training would probably not have been sought. Hence, relatively few business MPs attended public schools or Oxford or Cambridge, the traditional routes to political leadership.

Furthermore, because both business and political office were time consuming, most businessmen probably did not have time for both. And the dangers of turning over one’s business interests to another person are well illustrated by the case of Richard Cobden. When he assumed leadership of the Anti-Corn Law League, he passed on the management of his family’s business to his brother who subsequently wrecked it. Finally, business MPs continually complained that the House sat too long past mid-night and that daily schedules were not adhered to, making it difficult to schedule other work. Clearly, business MPs in the mid-nineteenth century had many excellent reasons for avoiding office, as well as non-business subjects, and for limiting themselves to what they knew and did best - business.

Were they a world apart – a theme running through this chapter? Yes. They were not as well educated as those running the government or those in the

old professions/income groups of the landed, the military, and barristers. Their club memberships had a different profile, and they received far fewer honors. They were disproportionately in the Liberal party and its coalition partners, they were disproportionately non-Church of England in religious affiliation, and the character of their interests is different, oriented toward government finance, business and economics, and government administration.

Yet many of the major domestic accomplishments of this Parliament were business related: reduction of and changes in the mix of taxation, improvement of government administration, and progress on the development of a system of limited liability. In other areas, such as foreign affairs, business' interest in tariffs, for instance, were accentuated by the government.

Why might this be? After the split of the Conservative Party, the more 'liberal' of the Conservatives largely had joined the Peelites, and their coalition with the Liberals and their other allies, which had a substantial percentage of the businessmen MPs as members means that their governing coalition's interests probably aligned substantially with the interests of those businessmen.

Chapter Two

BUSINESSMEN IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, 1895-1900

Background

After electoral reforms in 1868 and 1886, the number of parliamentary constituencies stood at 670. Four hundred sixty members represented geographic constituencies in England, two represented Oxford and two Cambridge, both universities having had representatives in Parliament since 1603, and one representing the University of London that had had this seat since 1868. One hundred and one represented constituencies in Ireland with an additional two representing the University of Dublin (Trinity College), seventy sat for Scotland, two for Scottish Universities (the Universities of Glasgow and Aberdeen combined one and the Universities of Edinburgh and St. Andrews the other) and thirty represented Wales.¹

In the course of the five years of this Parliament, mid-1895 to early 1900, ninety-five vacancies were caused by a host of reasons including: rejection of results on petition, MPs being elected to more than one constituency, death, resignation, elevation to the peerage, or assumption of judgeships. Thus, 765 men have been identified as being members of this Parliament over its term. The political affiliations of these men are as follows on Table 26:

Table 26
Political Affiliation of MPs, 1895-1900

Conservative	374
Liberal Unionist	84
Liberal	196
Radical	21
Anti-Parnellite Irish Nationalist	67
Parnellite Home Ruler	13
Other	10
Total	765

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900.]

The government was formed of a Conservative and Liberal Unionist party coalition. The Marquess of Salisbury, a Conservative, was Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary and his nephew, Arthur James Balfour (C., Manchester East), was First Lord of the Treasury and leader of the government in the House of Commons (he would succeed his uncle as Prime Minister upon Salisbury's death in 1902.) There were four Liberal-Unionists in an otherwise Conservative Cabinet: two peers, the Duke of Devonshire, President of the Council, and the Marquess of Lansdowne, Secretary of State for War, and Joseph Chamberlain (Birmingham West), head of the Liberal-Unionists in the Commons, who was Secretary of State for Colonies and George J. Goschen (St. George's, Hanover Square), First Lord of the Admiralty.

As in the previous chapter, if one uses Dod's Parliamentary Companion to create an archive of the members and then, using Burke's Peerage, Burke's Landed Gentry, Boase's Modern English Biography, Bateman's Great Landholders of Great

Britain and Ireland, the British Bibliographical Archives Seventeenth Through the Nineteenth Century, the Dictionary of Business Biography and the Dictionary of Scottish Business Biography, and the Dictionary of National Biography, including its supplements, an archive with extensive information can be created. Table 27 outlines the distribution of profession/income groups in this Parliament.

Table 27
Profession / Income Groups, Parliament of 1895-1900

Profession / Income Source	Number	Percentage
Land	75	9.8
Government	50	6.5
Military	67	8.8
Barrister	172	22.5
Solicitor	22	2.9
Medical Doctors	13	1.7
Education	11	1.4
Writer / Journalist	17	2.2
Labour	17	2.2
Business	287	37.5
Other / Unknown	34	4.4
Total	765	99.9*

Deviation from 100% due to rounding error.

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900.]

Business is the largest category followed by barristers, landholders, and the military. Government covers more than the cabinet and sub-cabinet, there were also former colonial administrators and diplomats in this group. We will look at the

groups in more detail below.

If the political affiliations for these profession/income groups are correlated, the following table is created (Table 28):

Table 28
Political Affiliation of Profession/Income Groups

	C	LU	L	R	APIN	PHR	OTHER
Land	52	3	8	2	8	1	1
Government	29	7	12		1	1	
Military	54	6	5	1	1		
Barrister	91	18	49	3	7	3	1
Solicitor	7	2	6		5		2
MD	1		2	3	5	2	
Education	1	3	6				1
Writer/Journalist	4	2	4		6	1	
Labour		1	9	3	1	1	3
Business	120	40	88	9	26	2	2
Other/unknown	15	2	7		7	2	
Total	374	84	196	21	67	13	10

Note, through out the rest of this paper these abbreviations will be used:

C = Conservative LU = Liberal Unionist L = Liberal R = Radical
APIN = Anti-Parnellite Irish Nationalist PHR = Parnellite Home Ruler

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900.]

While the Conservative party has long been thought of as the party of the landed class, and indeed they do concentrate here (see below), their numbers are far outweighed by businessmen and barristers. Also, while there are more businessmen in the Conservative ranks than the other political parties, businessmen are not as large

a percentage of the Conservatives as they are of the Liberals.

Two tables can be generated with the information from Table 28. The first is a table of the percentage of each Profession/Income group in each party (Table 29); the second is the percentage that each Profession/Income group makes of the separate political parties (Table30).

Table 29

Percentage of Professions / Income Source by Parties

	C	LU	L	R	APIN	PHR	O	Total %
Land	69.3	4.0	10.7	2.7	10.7	1.3	1.3	100.0
Government	58.0	14.0	24.0		2.0	2.0		100.0
Military	80.6	9.0	7.5	1.5	1.5			100.1
Barrister	52.9	10.5	28.5	1.7	4.1	1.7	0.6	100.0
Solicitor	31.8	9.0	27.3		22.7		9.0	99.8
MD	7.7		15.4	23.1	38.5	5.8		100.1
Education	9.0	27.3	54.5				9.0	99.8
Writer/Journalist	23.5	11.8	23.5		35.3	5.8		99.9
Labour		5.6	50.0	16.7	5.6	5.6	16.7	100.2
Business	41.8	13.9	30.7	3.1	9.1	0.7	0.7	100.0
Other / Unknown	45.5	6.0	21.2		21.2	6.0		99.9

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900.]

Table 30
Each Profession / Income Source as a Percentage of Each Parliamentary Party

	C	LU	L	R	APIN	PHR	O
Land	13.9	3.5	4.0	9.5	11.9	7.7	10
Government	7.8	8.3	6.0		1.5	7.7	
Military	14.4	7.1	2.6	4.8	1.5		
Barrister	24.3	21.4	25.0	14.3	10.4	23.1	10
Solicitor	1.9	2.4	3.1		7.5		20
MD	0.3		1.0	14.3	7.5	15.4	
Education	0.3	3.6	3.1				10
Writer/Journalist	1.1	2.4	2.0		9.0	7.7	
Labour		1.2	4.6	14.3	1.5	7.7	30
Business	32.1	47.6	45.9	42.9	38.8	15.4	26.0
Other/Unknown	4.0	2.4	3.6		10.4	15.4	
Total Percentage	100.1	100	99.9	100.1	100	100.1	100

Any percentage totals slightly greater than or less than 100% are due to rounding error.

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900.]

Looking at Table 29, while nearly 70% of the landed were in the Conservative party, a surprisingly large percentage, 10.7% each, were in the Liberal and APIN parties. And compared to the landed, an even larger percentage of the military members, nearly 81%, were in the Conservative party. With the then current administration being a coalition of Conservative and Liberal Unionist, it is understandable that nearly 60% of those listed as employed in government were in the Conservative party and, if one adds the Liberal Unionist ministers, nearly 72% were from the governing coalition. Those in government from the Liberals were leaders of the opposition (alternative government in waiting), and the two individuals

in APIN and PHR had been government employees.

Barristers heavily favored the Conservative and Liberal parties, as did solicitors, though many solicitors were also in the APIN. Other/Unknown could also be defined as “no visible means of support,” probably were rentiers, and again were heavily in the Conservative, Liberal and APIN parties.

On the other hand, those in education were largely Liberal affiliated, followed by Liberal Unionist, with only one, representing 9% of the professional classification, in the Conservative party. Medical doctors were disproportionately concentrated in the APIN and Radicals, less so in the Liberals and PHR with one doctor a Conservative. Writers/Journalists were fairly broadly dispersed with nearly a quarter of their ranks in both the Conservative and Liberal parties, over a third in the APIN, nearly an eighth in the Liberal Unionists, and a sixteenth in the PHR. Business was most heavily concentrated in the two old parties, nearly forty-two percent in the Conservatives and over thirty percent in the Liberals with the Liberal Unionists and APIN trailing. This is a considerable change from forty years before, when more than two thirds of businessmen in Parliament were affiliated with the liberal coalition.

Table 30, the percentage of each political party constituted by the various Profession/Income groups, reveals other information. For instance, while the Conservatives were the largest party in the Parliament and had the largest number of businessmen in this Parliament in their ranks, businessmen totaled slightly less than a third of the Conservative parliamentary party ranks, whereas businessmen made up nearly 48% of the Liberal Unionists, just short of 46% of the Liberals, nearly 43% of

Radicals, and even nearly 39% of APIN.

Politics in this Parliament were complex. The government was formed of a coalition of Conservatives and Liberal Unionists with Liberals and Radicals the opposition, and those in favor of Irish Home Rule fractured between the Parnellites and their opponents. By combining the parties making up these coalitions we get the following distribution (Tables 31 and 32):

Table 31

Profession/Income Groups in the Political Blocks, Parliament of 1895-1900

	C & LU	L & R	APIN & PHR	Other	Total
Land	55	10	9	1	75
Government	36	12	2		50
Military	60	6	1		67
Barristers	109	52	10	1	172
Solicitors	9	6	5	2	22
MDs	1	5	7		13
Education	4	6		1	11
Writer/Journalist	6	4	7		17
Labour	1	12	2	3	18
Other	17	7	9		33
Business	160	97	28	2	287
Total	458	217	80	10	765

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900.]

Table 32
Percentage of Profession/Income Groups by Party Affiliation
in Parliament of 1895-1900

	C & LU	L & R	APIN & PHR	Other
Land	12.0	4.6	11.3	10
Government	7.9	5.5	2.5	
Military	13.1	2.8	1.3	
Barristers	23.8	24.0	12.5	10
Solicitors	2.0	2.8	6.3	20
MDs	0.2	2.3	8.8	
Education	0.9	2.8		10
Writer/Journalist	1.3	1.8	8.8	
Labour	0.2	5.5	2.5	30
Other	3.7	3.2	11.3	
Business	34.9	44.7	35.0	20
Total	100.0	100.0	100.3	100

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion

The Landed.

It has often been noted that Salisbury's last administration was disproportionately landed. Salisbury lamented that the long and (in his opinion) relative happy rule of the landed elite was passing. Indeed, the number of landed gentlemen in Parliament had dropped considerably from mid-century and the period from the 1870s through the early 1890s saw a steep decline in agricultural profits (reflected in Lady Bracknell's famous statement in *The Importance of Being Earnest*, first performed, by the way, in February 1895, "What between the duties expected of one during one's lifetime, and the duties expected from one after one's death, land

has ceased to be either a profit or a pleasure. It gives one position and prevents one from keeping it.”²) Nevertheless, there were still a significant number of MPs whose income seems to be based on land (the third largest income block) and they were disproportionately in the Conservative party.³

From tables 27 and 31 we can see that 75 members of this Parliament are recorded as being landed. However, in addition to the seventy-five, another 127 had connections to landed interests, either by owning sufficient land themselves but having other professions (government, barristers and those in the military especially), or being in business and investing surplus reserves in land, or marrying into landed families. Table 33 presents this information:

Table 33

Land Ownership by Other Professions/Income Groups

Acres	<5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	>20,000	Total
Government	3	5	9	13	30
Military	9	0	6	11	26
Barrister	13	2	1	1	17
Business	15	7	5	4	31
Academic			1		1
MD			1		1
Total	40	14	23	29	106

[Source: Dod’s Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900, Bateman, The Great Landowners of Great Britain and Ireland, 1883]

In addition to the above table, there are others whose connections to land are a bit more tenuous but nevertheless real. Eighteen members within other professions

(nine in business, four in government, three military and two barristers) indirectly had interests in real estate through property-owning in-laws. Four: two of who were in government, one in the military, and one a businessman, were related to landholders as grandchildren or nephews. And finally, six: three barristers, two businessmen, and one academic, were cousins of landholders. The political breakdown of all of these is shown in Table 34:

Table 34
Political Breakdown of Table 33

	C	LU	L	R	APIN	PHR	Other
Government	25	2	3				
Military	20	2	3		1		
Barrister	10	5	2				
Business	15	8	6	1			1
Education	1						
MD			1				
Subtotal	71	17	15	1	1		1
Plus Others							
In-Laws	12	4	2				
Grandparents	1	1	1				1
Cousins	3	2	1				
Total	87	24	18	1	1		2

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900, Bateman, The Great Landowners of Great Britain and Ireland, 1883]

Of the 374 Conservative party members of the House of Commons, from Table 28 we find that fifty-two seemingly had income solely from land (although they probably also had rentier income – something we cannot trace) and from Table 34

another seventy-one had an interest in income-producing real property, and there were a further sixteen who had a more tenuous, but probably sympathetic, connection to the land. This totals $52 + 71 = 123 + 16 = 139$. This is respectively 32.9% and 37.2% of the Conservative party's representation in Parliament. This is close in size to the business interest in the Conservative party's Parliamentary body.

Some representative examples of the foregoing landed MPs follow. The great landholders, Dukes, Marquesses, and Earls, often had heirs or younger sons who served in Parliament. Two Cavendish (Duke of Devonshire) relatives were in this Parliament, including the future 9th Duke. Devonshire's holdings totaled over 193,000 acres producing £180,000 per annum according to Bateman. The Honourable Herbert Valentine Duncombe, (C.) third son of the Earl of Faversham, sat for Cumberland West. His father had 39,312 acres producing £34,328. And, perhaps the most highly connected MP was John Douglas Sutherland, Marquess of Lorne (L. U., Manchester South), heir to the Duke of Argyle (175,114 acres, £50,842); grandson, through his mother, of the Duke of Sutherland (1,358,545 acres, £141,667); and son-in-law of the Queen. He did have a day job. He was Governor and Constable of Windsor Castle. Most of those above fall into our second grouping of those with property interests, heirs or sons of the aristocracy, serving in the military or government as training for assuming their eventual responsibilities.

Among those with smaller but still significant holdings were the following baronets: Sir John J. Dillwyn-Llewellyn, Bt. (C., Swansea), 14,867 acres, £9,939; Sir William Hart Dyke, Bt. (C., Dartford), 8,865 acres, £11,474; and Sir John S.

Maxwell, 10th Bt. (C., Wigtownshire), 20,814 acres, £29,854. These representative baronets, and their fellow baronets, generally had considerable landholdings in one area, substantial income, and were usually the leaders of the localities in which they lived.

Those whose landholdings were smaller yet still sufficient so that seemingly they did not need to have another career included: John Hutten (C., Richmond), 2,947 acres, £5,706; William Lucas-Shadwell (C., Hastings), 3,689 acres, £4,230; and W. H. Wilson Todd (C., Yorkshire – East Riding – Howdenshire), 4,534 acres, £5,560. Finally, examples of those who had other employment to which land was a supplement or a pleasure: Sir J. B. Edwards (C., Hythe), retired Lieutenant General, 4,279 acres, £6,887; A. G. H. Gibbs (C., City of London), partner in Anthony Gibbs and Sons, 3,405 acres, £6,177; and Sir George Russell (C., Berkshire – Wokingham), barrister and railway chairman, 2,381 acres, £3,774.

Government

Fifty members of this Parliament were or had been in government or royal service. Some were minor functionaries such as C. J. Engledew, (APIN, Kildare North), who had acted as ADC and private secretary to Sir Robert W. Harley when he was Governor of Grenada in the Windward Islands, and James M. Paulton, (L., Durham), who had been private secretary to Childers and Asquith when they successively served as Home Secretary. A few had held minor administrative offices. William Joseph Corbet, (PHR, Wicklow-East) had been clerk for six years and then

chief clerk for twenty-four years to the Irish Lunacy Office. An early backer of Parnell, author of *What Is Home Rule*, he stuck with Parnell after the distress caused by the O'Shea divorce and subsequent struggle within the Irish Nationalist party.

Some advanced from minor positions. Sir Edward Gray (L., Berwick-on-Tweed) had been private secretary to Sir Evelyn Baring, assistant secretary to the Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1884 and 1885, and Parliamentary Secretary for Foreign Affairs from 1892 to 1895. From 1898, while out of office, he sat on the board of the Northeast Railway becoming chairman in 1904, only to retire in 1905 to assume the position of Secretary of the Foreign Office, a post he held until 1916.

Some would go on to be Prime Minister. Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman, (L., Stirling), had served in a variety of posts in the departments of War, Admiralty, Ireland and Local Governing Board culminating as Secretary of the War Department under Rosebery. He led the Liberal opposition during this Parliament and would become Prime Minister. And, perhaps, some did not fulfill the hopes of their family. Herbert John Gladstone, (L., Leeds West), son of William Gladstone, held a host of political positions beginning as private secretary to his father and terminating as Secretary of State for the Home Department in the new century. Later he would become the first Governor-General and High Commissioner to South Africa.

Royal service was an avenue open to members of the aristocracy. Besides the Marquess of Lorne, already mentioned, was Lord Arthur William Hill, (C., County Down), who had previously been comptroller of Her Majesty's Household, and Richard George Penn, Viscount Curzon, (C., Buckinghamshire – Wycombe), who

was Treasurer to Her Majesty's Household from 1896 to 1900. In 1900 Curzon succeeded to his father's Peerage, becoming Earl Howe.

The empire provided opportunities for service. Sir William Wedderburn, Bt., (L., Banffshire) had been a member of the Bombay Civil Service from 1860 to 1887, including stints in the judiciary and as Chief Secretary to the Bombay government. He returned to the United Kingdom after succeeding his brother as baronet. M. M. Bhownagree, (C., Bethnel Green), was for ten years the head of the Bombay State Agency before emigrating to Britain and becoming a barrister. Several members had been in the foreign service as well as colonial service. Sir Henry Stafford Northcote, Bt, (C., Exeter), for example, had been in the Diplomatic Corps, private secretary to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, financial secretary to the War Office, and held various administrative and royal commissions culminating in his becoming Governor of Bombay in 1899 and Governor General of Australia from 1903 to 1908

Some may have received office by stint of relationship. James E. H. Gascoigne-Cecil, Viscount Cranborne, (C., Rochester), was heir and private secretary to his father, the Marquess of Salisbury. He would go on to serve as Undersecretary of State in the Foreign Office, Lord Privy Seal (following his succession to the Marquisate) and President of the Board of Trade. His brother, Lord Hugh R. H. Cecil, (C., Greenwich), fifth son of Salisbury, also served as private secretary to his father. And another family member was Gerald W. Balfour, (C., Leeds Central), brother of Arthur Balfour. Gerald, previously private secretary to his brother, during this Parliament was Chief Secretary for Ireland. Subsequently, he would become

President of the Board of Trade, and for a few weeks in 1905, President of the Local Governing Board. Defeated in 1906, he retired from public service and sat on numerous company boards.

It wasn't just the Hotel Cecil and old-line political families who had dynasties. Joseph Austen Chamberlain, (L. U. – Worcestershire East), son of Joseph (see below), had been private secretary to his father, was Civil Lord of the Admiralty in this administration, and would become Financial Secretary to the Treasury, Postmaster General (and in the cabinet) and Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1903. Later he would be in the war cabinet during the First World War, at the Exchequer again, and Secretary of Foreign Affairs in 1924.

Of the nineteen cabinet members in the new government of 1895, ten came from the House of Commons. The nine Peers in the cabinet were: the Marquess of Salisbury, Prime Minister and Secretary of the Foreign Office; Lord Halebury, Lord High Chamberlain; the Duke of Devonshire, President of the Council; Viscount Cross, Privy Seal; Marquess Lansdowne, Secretary of War; Earl Cadogan, Lord Lieutenant – Ireland; Lord Ashland, Lord Chancellor – Ireland; Lord Balfour of Burleigh, Secretary for Scotland and Vice President of the Scottish Education Board; and Lord James of Hereford, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.

In ascending order, the House of Commons' members of the cabinet were: Walter Hume Long, (C., Liverpool, West Derby), a member of an old, landed family who was President of the Board of Agriculture. Aretas Akers-Douglas, (C., Kent – St. Augustine), also a member of a landed family, was First Commissioner of Works

until 1902. In this position he oversaw the coronation of Edward VII. Henry Chaplin, (C., Lincolnshire–Seaford), a classic country gentleman, close to the Royal family as a friend of the Prince of Wales from days at the University, served in the cabinet as President of the Local Governing Board.

Charles Thomson Ritchie (C., Croydon), a retired jute spinner who had operated the firm Ritchie and Son, Ltd., was President of the Board of Trade. Lord George Francis Hamilton, (C., Middlesex – Ealing), third son of the Duke of Abercorn (78,662 acres, £53,400), grandson (maternally) of the Duke of Bedford (86,335 acres, £141,793), son-in-law of the Earl of Harewood (29,620 acres, £38,118), had been in Parliament since 1868 and sat in this cabinet as Secretary of State for India from 1895 to 1903.

George Joachim Goschen, (L. U., St. George's, Hanover Square), was First Lord of the Admiralty in this administration, having previously been Vice President of the Board of Trade, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, President of the Poor Law Board, First Lord of the Admiralty, and Chancellor of the Exchequer. He had, however, turned down the Vice-Royalty of India in 1880, Secretary of State for War in 1882, and the Speakership in 1883. Prior to government service he had been a member of the firm Franklin and Goschen, foreign exchange bankers, a director of the Bank of England (at age 27) and wrote *Theory of the Foreign Exchanges* in 1861.⁴

Sir Michael Edward Hicks-Beach, Bt, (C., of Bristol West), also of an old (descended from Sir Michael Hicks, Secretary to William Cecil, first Lord Burghley) landed family (11,334 acres, £10,467), was Chancellor of the Exchequer, having

previously been Parliamentary Secretary to the Poor Law Board, Undersecretary of the Home Department, Chief Secretary for Ireland, and Secretary of State for the Colonies. He was made a Viscount in 1906 and advanced to an Earldom in 1915.

Joseph Chamberlain, (L. U., Birmingham West), was Secretary of State for the Colonies. After the sale (to his cousins) of his immediate family's interest in the screw manufacturing business (see chapter 4.), he was Mayor of Birmingham three times, Chairman of the Birmingham School Board, President of the School of Design, and Chairman of the National Educational League. First elected to Parliament in 1876, he had been President of the Board of Trade in 1880 and President of the Local Governing Board in 1886.

Sir Matthew White Ridley, 6th Bt (10,152 acres, £12,189), (C., Blackpool), in Parliament since 1868, he served as Undersecretary of the Home Department, Financial Secretary to the Treasury, and now Home Secretary. Granted a peerage in 1900, he became chairman of Northeast Railway in 1902, and died in 1904.

Arthur James Balfour, (C., Manchester East), was First Lord of the Treasury and leader of the government in the House of Commons. In spite of being nephew of Salisbury (his mother's brother), godson of Wellington, and possessor of 87,196 acres, his family was not of ancient lineage; his grandfather having made the fortune as a contractor in India. He had been in Parliament since 1874 serving as President of the Local Governing Board, Secretary of State for Scotland (where his lands lay), Chief Secretary of Ireland, and first Lord of the Treasury and leader in Commons. He would succeed his uncle in 1902 as Prime Minister and serve in that capacity through

1905. In the subsequent election, the Tories were routed and even Balfour lost his seat. After finding a safe seat, he resumed leadership of the Conservatives. His decision to block Liberal legislation in the House of Lords led to Lloyd-George's 'Peoples Budget,' which was aimed directly at the peerage's pocketbook. This resulted in Lord's rejection of the budget, the constitutional crises, and the passage of the Parliament Act of 1911, which limited the House of Lords to a two-year delay of legislation. Balfour resigned the leadership of the party. Later he sat in the cabinet during the First World War as First Lord of the Admiralty and then Foreign Secretary. He was created Earl Balfour in 1922.⁵

In a cabinet of nineteen, four businessmen constituted just over 20% of the cabinet, the rest being largely from the landed portions of the two coalition partners, the Conservatives and the Liberal Unionists. With businessmen constituting 37.5% of the membership of this Parliament, they were underweighted in this cabinet.

Military

Seventy-seven members of the military, current or former, were identified, however, ten have been listed under other headings because of subsequent careers, resulting in a net of sixty-seven members of the military in this Parliament. Eight had been in the navy, twenty in the four Guards regiments (Grenadiers, Coldstream, Life Guards, and Dragoons), and fifty in the regular army and the various Indian Raj armies (one guardsman is counted twice, having been seconded from the Life Guards to the Argyle and Sutherland Highlanders.) The military drew heavily from landed

families: five of the eight in the navy, all ten in the Grenadiers (although the landholdings of one Grenadier was inherited from a cousin), two of the five Coldstream Guards, three of the four Lifeguards, and twenty-nine of the fifty in the various imperial armies (the one Dragoon was not from a landed family). Thus, over 62% of the MPs from the navy were from landed families, 75% of the Guardsmen, and 58% of the regular armies' MPs.

Those from landed families in the navy included: Edward Mervyn Archdale, (C. U., Fermagh North), in the Royal Navy from 1866 to 1879, whose family held at least 34,000 acres in Fermagh and had represented it for generations; Lord Charles William De La Poer Beresford, (C., York City), in the Navy since 1859, who attained the rank of Rear Admiral in 1897 and was elevated to the peerage as Baron Beresford in 1916. His father, Marquess of Waterford, held 66,689 acres. And John Charles Scott, Earl of Dalkeith (C. U., Roxburghshire) heir to the Duke of Buccleuch and Queensbury (460,000 acres £ 217,000), who served nine years in the Navy.

Landholders in the Guards units included Sir Alexander Fullerton Acland-Hood, Bt., (C., Somerset – Wellington) in the Grenadier Guards for seventeen years reaching the rank of Captain, with over 11,000 acres producing in excess of £17,000 and who was elevated into the peerage in 1911, and Edward George Villiers, Lord Stanley, (C., Lancashire, Southeast), Lieutenant in the Grenadiers for ten years who in 1908 succeeded his father as the seventeenth Earl of Derby inheriting over 69,000 very valuable acres.

Landholdings of those in the regular army varied greatly in size. Among them we find Albert Brassey, (C. U., Oxfordshire, Banbury), son of a railway contractor, 7 years total in the military, mayor of Chipping Norton, 1898-1900, holding more than 4200 acres; W. C. B. Beaumont, (L., Northumberland), who succeeded to barony of Allendale in 1907, and was elevated to Viscount Allendale in 1911, 24,000+ acres; Viscount Milton, (L. U., Wakefield) grandson and heir to Earl Fitzwilliam, 115,700+ acres; and Lord Henry Cavendish-Bentinck (C., Nottingham South), half-brother and heir presumptive to the Duke of Portland, 183,200 acres.

Perhaps the most significant of the naval Members of this Parliament was Sir John Charles Ready Colomb, KCMG (C., Great Yarmouth). In the Navy for fifteen years after graduation from the Royal Naval College, Sir John's great contribution was his book The Protection of our Commerce and Distribution of our Naval Forces in which he articulated the idea of the Royal Navy as the "connecting chain" of the Empire, the concept that anchored the "Blue Water School" vision of the Navy.⁶

While two of the army MPs became Lieutenant Generals and four Major Generals, among the MPs who were in the army, two especially stand out. Sir James B. Edwards (C., Hythe) had developed the Imperial defense plan. After consultation with the colonies, his plan of a common organizational structure, integrated armaments and a single military college became the basis for much of the early twentieth century Imperial Defense plan. He rose to Lieutenant General. Sir Henry Marshman Havelock-Allan, VC, KCB, GCB, (L. Durham South-east) had been called the bravest man in the British Army. He received a Victoria Cross for leading his

command, on horseback at a foot pace, through grapeshot, directly at the muzzle of a cannon and capturing the gun at the battle of Cawnpore during the Indian Mutiny.⁷ Seriously wounded twice earlier in the campaign while marching with his father, (Major General) Sir Henry Havelock, to the relief of Lucknow, our Sir Henry was killed in 1857, in Afghanistan, while with his troops, the Royal Irish Regiment.

Barristers.

One hundred seventy-two Members of Parliament were barristers or advocates: representing one hundred sixteen English, thirteen Welsh, twenty-three Irish, and twenty Scottish constituencies. To become a barrister in England and Wales at the end of the nineteenth century required three years in training at one of four English Inns of Court: Lincolns Inn, Inner Temple, Middle Temple, and Grays Inn. Ireland's equivalent was Kings Inn. Scotland had retained its own legal system after the 1707 union with England, and an advocate's education was overseen by the Faculty of Advocates based in Edinburgh.⁸ After legal education and being admitted to the bar, English and Welsh barristers would practice their profession in London, or on circuit around the country, Irish barristers in Ireland, and Scot's advocates mainly in Edinburgh, where the high courts were seated. Occasionally, an Irish barrister or a Scot's advocate would join the English bar.

Membership in Parliament must have been of some utility to lawyers who, after all, only have their time and knowledge to sell. Sittings of Parliament are time consuming, could run late into the night, and paid nothing unless one had a

government post. Of course, there was the esteem from others that came from being a Member of Parliament. One can look at the positions occupied by these lawyers during and after their parliamentary career to see if one can find some clear utility to spending time seeking and occupying seats in Parliament (Table 35).

Table 35
Positions Held by Barristers while in or after Parliamentary Service

Government Administration	47
Parliament Administration	11
Judicial	11
Business	24
Other	16
None / Unknown	63

[Sources: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900, The Dictionary of National Biography, Boase's Modern English Biography, Boylan's Dictionary of Irish Biography, the British Biographical Archive: Seventeenth through the Nineteenth Centuries, and the Dictionary of Business Biography.]

At least ten of the barrister's had served in liberal led governments included Herbert H. Asquith (Fife East), Home Secretary in the Liberal government of 1892 to 1895, who would become Prime Minister in 1906; and James Bryce (Aberdeen South), known as an expert on the 'eastern question,' who generally filled the House when he spoke, was a prolific writer on history (and instrumental in founding the English Historical Review), and became Ambassador to the United States. He had previously served as Parliamentary Secretary to the Foreign Office and in the cabinet as Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. Finally, Sir Robert T. Reid, (Dumfries), who had been Solicitor General and Attorney General. In 1899, he was asked to represent the United Kingdom in the arbitration of the Venezuelan border dispute.

Later he became Lord Chancellor with the title Earl Loreburn.

Among those barristers who sought and held government administrative posts were such Conservatives as Edward H. Carson (Dublin University), Solicitor General – Ireland who was succeeded in that post in 1897 by Dunbar P. Barton, (Armagh), and Andrew G. Murray (Buteshire) formerly Solicitor General for Scotland, who became Lord Advocate, and in 1905 Lord Justice General for Scotland.

Among the Liberal Unionists were Sir William R. Anson, 3rd Bt., (Oxford University), a cousin of Viscount Anson and the Earl of Litchfield, who, following years devoted to the University, was elected in 1899 to occupy one of Oxford University's seats. Later he would become Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (1902 to 1905). Last, the Right Honourable Charles Pelham Villiers, third son of the Earl Clarendon, born in 1802, who since 1835 had sat continuously for Wolverhampton, served as President of the Poor Law Board from 1859 to 1866. "Father of the House of Commons," he died in January 1898.

Barristers from all parties participated in the administration of Parliament itself. Two examples are William C. Gully (L., Carlyle), who occupied the Speaker's Chair from 1895 to 1905, and upon retirement was elevated to the House of Lords as Viscount Selby; and Arthur Jon Aloysius O'Connor (APIN, Donegal East), who was deeply involved in Parliamentary Administration as Chairman of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Trade, member of the Public Accounts Committee, and Deputy Chairman of the Committee of the House of Commons. In 1900 he became Deputy Chairman of Ways and Means.

Eleven of the lawyers in this Parliament went on to careers in the judiciary. Notable among them were: John Fletcher Moulton (L., Cornwall), Senior Wrangler at Cambridge, a leading patent attorney and FRS for work in electricity. “In this class of work (patent) he was unrivalled. His mind worked with great rapidity; scientific facts and problems which others had to master laboriously presented no difficulties to him, and he had the gift of easy and lucid speech.”⁹ In 1906 he became Lord Justice of Appeal and later Lord of Appeal In Ordinary. Sir Richard E. Webster (C., Isle of Wight) had been “Tubman” and “Postman” in the old Court of Exchequer at Westminster. Subsequently he was Attorney General three times including during this Parliament, later becoming Master of the Rolls and Lord Chief Justice of England. Knighted in 1885, he was elevated to a Viscount in 1913. Finally, Sir John C. Bigham, (L. U., Liverpool Exchange Division), knighted in 1897 upon selection to the Queen’s bench, subsequently served on a variety of inquiry panels including heading the inquiry into the sinking of the Titanic, and the international conference on life safety at sea. He became Viscount Mersey.

A number of barristers had careers associated with business. Two, for instance, were directors of the Suez Canal Company: Henry T. Anstruther, (L. U., St. Andrews), a member of a well-known landed family, and Charles J. Monk (L. U., Gloucester). Another barrister, Henry Leigh-Bennett (C., Surrey Northwest), was a director of the London and Southwest Railway.

The fifth category in the chart above is ‘Other.’ Sir George O. Morgan, Bt. (L., Denbighshire East), was honored with the position of Treasurer of Lincolns Inn.

He had authored the Burial Bill of 1880 and the Married Women's Property Bill of 1882. William S. Robson (L., South Shields), a respected attorney, "... was responsible for placing the Children's Act on the statute book. The principle of raising the minimum age of half-timers in the cotton mills had been admitted by the government in the Education Bill of 1896, but it did not become law until Robson brought in his bill of 1899. Even then the government opposed it, and the Bill was only carried by the eloquence and tenacity with which Robson pleaded the cause of the children."¹⁰ Several barristers were involved with religious organizations, including Sir John Henry Kennaway, 8th Bt. (C., Devon - Honiton), president of the Church Missionary Society and a member of the Society for the Promotion of Christianity Among Jews; Stanley Leighton (C., Shropshire – Oswestry), a member of the Church of England's House of Laymen and a director of the Clergy Pension Institute; and Bernard Charles Malloy, (L., Kings County), formerly private Chamberlain to the Vatican.

The 'None / Unknown' category among the barristers includes many of the Irish members who, it seems, were loath to cooperate with the English by revealing much about themselves. This does make it a bit difficult for historians. James Laurence Carew, (Independent Parnellite, Dublin College Green) and Edward F. V. Knox, (APIN, Londonderry City), about whom little more is known, are examples. Others in this category who were not Irish include Robert Purvis (L. U., Peterborough) about whom I could find absolutely nothing more.

Solicitors.

Twenty-two are listed as solicitors, seven Conservatives, six Liberals, five Irish Nationalists, two Liberal Unionists and two Welsh Nationalists. Two of the seven conservative solicitors were involved in business, as were five of the six Liberals. None of the others were. Two, Sydney Gedge, (C., Walsall) and Henry H. Fowler, (L., Wolverhampton East), for instance, were affiliated with telegraph or telephone companies. Other solicitors were on the boards or otherwise affiliated with banks, breweries, shipping, railway, insurance, property, construction and building materials companies.

Medical Doctors.

There were thirteen surgeons or medical doctors in this Parliament, seven of whom represented Ireland. Among them were Daniel Ambrose, (APIN, Louth South), who died in 1895 after election but before he could take his seat, and his cousin Robert Ambrose, (APIN, Mayo West) who originated the idea of compulsory land purchase in Ireland in 1897.

Four represented Scottish constituencies, two of whom were Robert Farquharson (L., Aberdeenshire West), 16,809 acres in Aberdeen producing £6166, who had been assistant surgeon to the Coldstream Guards, Medical Officer at Rugby, and now was in charge of Private Bills for the House of Commons and Sir William Overend Priestly (C., Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities), the OB/GYN to the Royal Princesses. Finally two represented English constituencies: Sir B. Walter

Foster (Rad.) and Sir George D. Pilkington (L.) who represented respectively Derbyshire-Ilkeston Division and Lancashire-Southport.

Academicians.

Eleven MPs are defined as academicians, five at the primary or secondary level and six at the university level. Robert Cameron (L., Durham-Houghton le Spring) had been a teacher and later a member of the local school board; Ernest Gray (C., West Ham North) was a schoolmaster and former president of the National Union of Teachers; and John T. Middlemore (L. U. Birmingham North) of the family which had owned the Manor of Edgbaston, devoted himself for thirty years to the Middlemore Children's Emigrant and Home School which trained destitute children in primary, secondary, and technical education and sent them out into the Empire.

Four were lecturers or professors including Owen Morgan Edwards (Welsh Nationalist –Merionethshire) a fellow in history at Lincoln College, Oxford who wrote and published magazines and books on Wales; and Richard Cloverhouse Jebb, (C., Cambridge University), a fellow at Trinity College Cambridge, who became Professor of Greek at Glasgow and then returned to Cambridge as Regius Professor.

Writer/Journalists.

Those who have been defined as “writer/journalist” do not include those who owned periodicals, newspapers, or magazines, rather they are the ones who produced the texts for the publishers. Of the seventeen so designated, seven represented Irish

constituencies. Notable among them was: Justin McCarthy, (APIN, Langford North), head of the Irish Nationalist Party after the fall of Parnell, formerly editor of the *Morning Star*. Due to blindness he received a £300 civil list pension in 1902. James O'Kelly, (PHR, Roscommon North), educated at Trinity College and the Sorbonne, had served in the French army, been an editor of the *New York Herald* and was currently London editor for the *Irish Daily Independent*.

Two journalists would become newspaper owners. James H. Dalziel, (L., Kirkcaldy), was a journalist who would eventually own an interest in several newspapers, including the *Daily Chronicle*. Son of a shoemaker, in 1908 he would be knighted and in 1921 elevated to the Peerage as Baron Dalziel of Kirkcaldy. Charles P. Scott (L., Lancaster-Leigh Division) became editor of his cousin's newspaper, the *Manchester Guardian*, which he would buy in 1905 from his cousin's estate for £242,000. He was very active in civic affairs in Manchester.

Born in 1841, Sir Henry M. Stanley, (L.U., Lambeth North), GCB, 1899, originally named John Rowlands, emigrated to New Orleans where he claimed to have been adopted by a Mr. Stanley. He became a journalist and in the 1870s entered Africa looking for the lost Dr. Livingston. Stanley found him, of course.

Other authors included: Sydney C. Buxton (L., Tower Hamlets, Poplar Division), at this time editor of the Imperial Parliament Series. Undersecretary of State for the Colonies in Rosebery's administration, he would become Postmaster General, a cabinet member, and President of the Board of Trade after 1906, and later Governor-General of South Africa, and William E. H. Lecky, (L. U., Dublin

University), educated at Cheltenham College and Trinity College, Dublin, who sought “conciliation rather than destruction of the union” over the question of Ireland, had written The Declining Sense of the Miraculous, which was the first of two volumes on the history of Rationalism.

Labour.

Eighteen MPs in this Parliament were from the labouring class and identified themselves as Liberals, Socialists, or Radicals. Four of these men were affiliated with the mining trade. William Abraham (L. Cork County), who began working in Welsh mines at age nine, was a pioneer in Welsh trade unions and vice-president of the Monmouthshire and Southwest Sliding Scale Committee; Thomas Burt (Rad., Morpeth) was secretary of the Northumberland Miners Mutual Association; Benjamin Pickard (Advanced Liberal, Yorkshire – West Riding), had become president of the Miners Federation in 1888; and Samuel Woods (L., Essex – Walthamstow), was founder and president of the Lancashire Miners Association.

Among the other labour representatives was Joseph Arch, (L., Norfolk - Northwest), president of the National Agriculture Labour Union, who was described in the Concise Dictionary of National Biography as one who “did more than any other man of his time to improve conditions of agricultural workers.”¹¹ Henry Broadhurst, (Advanced L., Leicester), was a stonemason who held a sub-cabinet position as Parliamentary Secretary to the Home Office in 1886, Secretary to the Trades Union Conference’s Parliamentary Committee, and a member of the Trades Union Council

from 1875-1890. As the political positions of the labour movement turned leftward in the 1880s and 1890s, he was not inclined to follow.

Other/Unknown.

This is the catchall section, all of those who cannot be put elsewhere. To begin with there are the Irish who refused to reveal much about themselves. Patrick McDermott, (APIN, Kilkenny North) and James C. Flynn, (APIN of County Cork North) represent this phenomenon. Nothing is known about their source of income.

Professionals who don't fall into other categories are listed here. John Lloyd Gibbons, (L. U., Wolverhampton South), was an engineer and surveyor, Arthur Wellesley Soames (L., Norfolk South), was an architect, and Robinson Souttar (L, Dumfriesshire), had retired after twenty-two years as an engineer.

Some were known for their travels. Harry Robert Graham, (C., St. Pancras West), for example, had traveled three times around the world and had visited each of the colonies. Those involved in philanthropy and private good works are included here. William L. Ashmead Bartlett Burdett-Coutts, (C., Westminster), husband of Baroness Burdett-Coutts, had been deeply involved in his wife's philanthropies for a number of years before their marriage. He would be involved on his own account in a colonial enterprise.

About some one cannot be sure. William W. Carlile, (C., Buckinghamshire North), Walter R. Greene, (C., Cambridgeshire West), and Francis S. Stevenson, (L., Suffolk - Eye), had all attended public schools (two at Harrow, one at Eton), and two

had attended Oxford and one Cambridge. But there is no clear source of wealth in the records. Probably they were rentiers. Two who were rentiers are Augustus H. E. Allhusen (C., Salisbury), whose immigrant grandfather had started a chemical company. At his death in 1890, his grandfather's estate exceeded £1,100,000. The other is Thomas Fielden (C. U., Lancashire – Middleton) whose father and uncles had been very successful in cloth manufacturing, with one uncle leaving in 1889 in excess of £1,100,000, indicating the family was well endowed.

Businessmen's interests

287 businessmen have been identified as sitting in the Parliament of 1895-1900. They were in a variety of businesses and often had business interests outside of their main employment. Using our eighteen industry categories, a chart can be developed indicating the number of MPs in each business category and also the other business interests of these gentlemen (Table 36).

Table 36

Parliament of 1895-1900 Businessmen MPs Own Business Interests and Outside Directorships

		Bank	Ins	Fin	Ship	RW	Cotton	Wool & Linen	Merchant	Steel	Const	Ship Bldg	Tele	Brew	Dist	Util	Col.	News Pub	Other	Total
Bank	30		3	1	1	4				2		1				1	2		4	19
Ins	3					1												1		2
Fin	13		1			1							1						1	4
Ship	18		1			1							1						1	4
RW	9	1	1		1	1								1		1			4	10
Cotton	18	1	1			5	1												4	12
Wool & Linen	10		1			1											1	1		4
Merchant	48	3	6		1	1	1												1	13
Steel	13					2				1						1	2		2	8
Const	6									2							2		2	6
Ship Bldg	9					2				2							1			5
Tele	2																			
Brew	15																			
Dist	5											1							1	2
Util.	2																		1	1
Col.	12					1					1					1			1	4
News Pub	19			1															2	3
Other	55	3	2	2	2	3					1	1	3	1		1	4		16	39
Total	287	8	16	4	5	23	2			7	2	3	5	2		5	12	2	40	

[Sources: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900, The Dictionary of National Biography, Boase's Modern English Biography, Boylan's Dictionary of Irish Biography, the British Biographical Archive: Seventeenth through the Nineteenth Centuries, and the Dictionary of Business Biography.]

Key: Brew – Brewers; Col – Collieries; Const – Construction Contractors; Dist – Distillers; Fin – Other Financial; Ins – Insurance; New Pub – Newspaper Publisher; RW – Railways; Ship – Ship Owners; Ship bldg Mar Eng – Ship building and Marine Engineering; Tele – Telecommunications; Util – Utilities; see also List of Abbreviations, pp. xii-xv.

To read this table: First column on reader's left is list of lines of business, second column is number of MPs whose primary business is in that field, remainder of columns to the right represents number of those in the second column who have interests in these other fields. Thus, three of thirty bankers are involved also in the insurance industry.

To these 287 one can add the 59 non-businessmen MPs who were directors of companies (see below, Table 37). The total, 346, is nearly double the number of businessmen and non-businessmen directors in the Parliament of 1852-1857. The complexity of business relationships of the MPs also had increased, with the 287 businessmen having 136 directorships or business interests in addition to their own. We will review in some detail the accomplishments of these different men.

Finance is a broad term involving banking, stockbrokerage, insurance, and fund management. In this Parliament there were thirty 'bankers' who were MPs. Banker is a term that includes traditional deposit and loan, or high street banking, as well as investment banking. Examples of traditional bankers included 'country' bankers such as E. W. Beckett (C., Yorkshire, North Riding), heir presumptive to his uncle, Lord Grimsthorp, whom he succeeded in 1905, a partner in his family bank, Becketts, of Leeds; Thomas B. Bolitho (L. U., Cornwall, St. Ives), of Bolitho's bank of Penzance; and three Peases, Sir Joseph, Bt. granted in 1882, (L., Durham, Bernard Castle), his son, Joseph Albert (L., Northumberland, Tyneside), and Arthur Pease (L. U., Darlington), who were partners in J. and J. W. Pease banking, Darlington.

Some London based traditional bankers who were members of this Parliament included: Sir Horace Brand Townsend-Farquhar, Bt. (L. U., Marylebone West), who, as head partner of Samuel Scotts and Company, Bankers, of Cavendish Square, had merged his bank with Parrs Bank in 1894. Interestingly, Farquhar sat on the board of the British South Africa Company while he was chairman of the competing Exploration Company. Granted a peerage in 1898 (he was a friend of the Prince of

Wales), he was elevated to an Earldom in 1922. Sir John Lubbock, 4th Bt., first Baron Avebury (1900 creation) (L. U., London University) whose bank merged with Coutts; Richard Biddulph Martin (L. U., Worcestershire Mid Division), senior partner of Martin and Company; and John Herbert Dudley Ryder (C., Gravesend), partner in Coutts and Company, who became the fifth Earl Harrowby. Some bankers were involved in overseas banking, such as George J. Goschen, Jr. (C., Sussex East Grimsted), chairman of the London City and Midland Bank who was also chairman of the Imperial Ottoman Bank, as well as a director of the Bank of Roumania. Goschen succeeded his father as a Viscount in 1907. His father (see above), a retired banker who subsequently became a politician, was granted a peerage in 1900 .

Banking is a broad term often used to describe activities other than deposits and loans. Representative of investment banking and higher finance were Ferdinand James de Rothschild (L. U., Buckinghamshire, Aylesbury), whose wife (also cousin) had died with no heirs. He founded a hospital in her name and never remarried. When he died in 1898, he was succeeded in the company by his cousin, Lionel Walter Rothschild, (L. U.), who was also elected to his seat in Parliament in 1899. Some others involved in finance included Sir Samuel Montague, Bt., (L., Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel), foreign exchange trader, and Harry Simeon Samuel (C. U., Tower Hamlets, Limehouse), a partner in Montefiore and Company. Stockbrokerage is related to finance through the trading of financial instruments. Frederick G. Banbury (C. U., Camberwell, Peckham Division), and Ferdinand F. Begg (C., Glasgow, St. Rolox), opposed each other in a dispute over the rules of the stock exchange.

Banbury lost. He subsequently closed his firm. Benjamin Louis Cohen (C., Islington), Lord Alwayne Frederick Compton (L. U., Bedfordshire - Biggleswade Division), Alexander Henderson (L., Staffordshire West), and Sir William Cuthbert Quilter, Bt. (L. U., Suffolk, Sudbury), were successful stockbrokers or leading members of such firms. Quilter received a baronetage in 1897, Henderson received one in 1902, and was elevated to a peerage in 1916 as Baron Faringdon, and Banbury became Baron Banbury of Southam in 1924.

One of the most successful financiers of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century was John Wynford Philipps, successor to an ancient relatively impoverished baronetage (he would be 13th, succeeding in 1912). Trained in law (Middle Temple) he joined the board of an investment trust and became chairman and led it successfully through the Barings Crisis of 1890. He would go on to organize other trusts and finance much of early twentieth century British industry. He eventually became Viscount St. Davids. There is more on him in chapter four.

Insurance companies are a major source of funds for investment. Properly priced insurance contracts should produce revenue in excess of immediate underwriting, sales, and management expenses; and when these excess funds are aggregated, very large sums become available for investment. England had long been a major center for the insurance industry. Among those in this Parliament in the field were Charles McArthur (L. U., Liverpool - Exchange), an Average Adjuster in the Marine Insurance field, Sir John W. MacLure, Bt., (C., Lancashire - Stretford Division), an insurance broker, manager of Guardian Insurance Company, and trustee

or director of other institutions including railways, and Thomas P. Whittaker (L., Yorkshire - Spen Valley), previously an author and newspaper editor, who had become Chairman and Managing Director of the United Kingdom Temperance and General Provident Institution (today known as U. K. Provident.)

Related to finance by providing the vital service of verifying the accuracy of financial records was accounting, a profession which had come into its own over the previous half century. Three MPs in this Parliament were accountants: Walter O. Clough (L., Portsmouth), head of Clough, Armstrong, Ford, Chartered Accountants; Harry S. Foster (C. U., Suffolk North) who had been senior partner of Foster, Hight, and Company, and later became managing director of Trust and Financial Corporation; and finally, Victor Christian William Cavendish (L. U., Derbyshire West), graduate of Eton and Cambridge, who had trained in the city as an accountant for several years. Elected to this Parliament at age 30, he had just left accounting to study law at the Inner Temple. In 1900 he became Treasurer to the Royal Household. However, his path in life was already determined, for he was heir presumptive and destined to become the ninth Duke of Devonshire.

Those in finance often sat on the boards of other companies. Some bankers who did included Robert Dickinson of Stuckeys Somerset Bank who sat on the board of The National Provident Institution, C. T. Murdoch of Barclay, Ransome, and Company who was a director of two insurance companies and of a waterworks, and Sir James T. Kitson, Bt., Chairman of Yorkshire Banking, who owned an iron and steel foundry, was a director of the North East Railway, and later became a director of

an oil company. On the other hand, there were also bankers such as E. W. Beckett, T. B. Bolitho, and Richard B. Martin, who did not serve on the boards of other companies. Some of those involved in insurance held outside directorships such as, Sir John MacLure, Bt., the manager of Guardian Insurance Company, who was a director of two railways, while on the other hand, Thomas Whittaker of U. K. Provident held no other board seats. J. W. Philipps and another financier, Charles Morrison, often had brothers or other associates sit on the boards of the companies they backed. For instance, Morrison's brother, Walter, our MP, (L.U., Yorkshire – Skipton) was chairman of his brother's South American railway.

In turn, financial companies had board seats that had to be filled. Eight business MPs whose primary businesses were other than banking were directors of banks. Among them were the merchants, J. S. Gilliot (C., Lancashire, Widnes Division) and E. Hubbard (C., Lambeth, Brixton); the printer H. H. Bemrose (C. U., Derby); and the brewer and railway chairman H. C. O. Bonsor (C., Surrey, Wimbledon.) Bonsor, Gilliot, and Hubbard were directors of the Bank of England, and Bemrose of Parris Banking. Similarly sitting on the boards of insurance and other financial companies were a large number of directors whose main employment was not in the financial field. In all probability they were sought out to give the insurance and finance companies insights into their industries. Examples included Edward Boulnois (C., Marylebone, East), owner of a retailer called the Baker Street Bazaar and chairman of a waterworks who was a director of London Life Insurance Company; Sir William Dunn (L., Paisley), a merchant who was a director of Union

Discount Company and of Royal Exchange Insurance; and J. T. Firbank, (C., Hull East), a railway contractor, director of a slate company, who also served as a director of Union Assurance Company. Thus, through directorships, finance was deeply integrated into the British commercial establishment, with businessmen sitting on the boards of banks and other financial firms, and leaders of banks and financial firms and their associates sitting on corporate boards. A number of financiers were granted knighthoods or baronetages, and a substantial number of London based financiers succeeded to or were elevated into the peerage.

In the fourth chapter we will see the disposition of some of these financial firms. Suffice it to say here that many of these banks merged with others (Scotts being an example around the time of this Parliament) and that most of the insurance companies also consolidated. Union Assurance, for instance, merging with Commercial Union Assurance in the early twentieth century;¹² Royal Insurance buying other insurance companies and finally merging with Sun Alliance Insurance, which was itself a merger of Sun and Alliance, the parent of Imperial Fire Insurance; and London Life Insurance's parent company, London Assurance, merging with Sun Alliance in 1965.¹³ UK Provident is still independent.

Old traditional industries in England included woolens, linen, and cotton. Eight MP's main business was in woolens, including Sir John Baker (L., Portsmouth), a woolen merchant, knighted as part of the new year's list in 1895; and John Brigg (L., Yorkshire Keighley), knighted in 1909, part owner of a family firm of worsted manufacturers, and previously mayor of Keighley. Two MPs were in the linen trade:

Thomas R. Lenty (L., Leeds East), a partner in Castleton Mills in Leeds and mayor of the Leeds just before the 1895 election, and Edward M'Hugh (APIN, Armagh, South), chairman and managing director of B. & E. M. M'Hugh and Company Linen Manufacturers and a director of the Irish Newspaper Company. All told, of the ten MPs in wool and linen trades, three had been involved in local politics as mayors of towns, one had been involved in national issues as private secretary to a cabinet member, and four were directors of companies other than their own. Honors were limited to knighthoods, and at that, half were granted nearly a decade after the end of this Parliament under the auspices of the competing party.

There were a number of men in the cotton and related trades and they can be divided into specialties. Five listed themselves as cotton manufacturers, including Thomas Gair Ashton (L., Bedfordshire-Luton division), who was a member of a family “well known, during generations, for singularly humane treatment of the work-people in their Cotton Mills.”¹⁴ In the 1870s, the Ashton business was the largest cotton manufacturer in the United Kingdom, and Ashton's father in 1898 left an estate of over £525,000. T. G. Ashton would be elevated to the Peerage in 1911 as Baron Ashton of Hyde.¹⁵ Another was ‘Colonel’ J. J. Mellor (L., Yorkshire-Sowerby), a partner in cotton mills, director and deputy chairman of a railway, and inventor of ‘Colonel Mellor's Patent’ field cooking range. Although a member of the Church of England, he had founded non-sectarian schools for the working class.

Nine represented themselves as cotton spinners among whom were William Henry Holland, (L., Yorkshire, West Riding, Rotherham), and Sir William Henry

Houldsworth, (C., Manchester North West). William Henry Holland succeeded his father in the family cotton and worsted business. He merged the company with the Fine Spinners Association becoming vice-chairman of the resulting firm. Sir William Henry Houldsworth, Bt., was a representative for Great Britain to the Monetary Conference of 1892. He received £546,000 in stock when he merged his firm with Fine Cotton Spinners in 1898. Additionally, four others were in businesses related to the cotton industry. One was retired cotton broker Samuel Smith (L., Flintshire), and three were or had been calico printers, including James Caldwell (L., Lanarkshire Mid-Division), who had retired from calico printing and most recently was Deputy Speaker and Deputy Chairman of Ways and Means.

Of the nineteen businessmen whose main business involvement was in the cotton trade, six had outside business interests, four of which were railway directorships. Politically, five had been or would be mayors and one would serve as a mayor after the term of this Parliament. Two had served the government on a commission or in parliamentary administration, and during the First World War two would serve in the government. One knighthood, five baronets and four baronies would be the honors received by these men, the peerages coming later.

MPs who were railway chairmen included J. M. Denny (C., Kilmarnock) of the Glasgow and Renfrew Railway; Sir Thomas Esmonde, 11th Bt., (Anti-Parnelite Liberal, Kerry West) of the Dublin and South Eastern Railway; and Walter Morrison, mentioned above, of the Central Argentine Railway. Some of our MPs were chairmen of railways although that was not necessarily what they were known for in

business. Examples include Alfred Baldwin (C., Worcestershire West), head of Baldwin Steel, chairman of the Great Western; Sir Joseph Pease, banker, chairman of the North Eastern Railway; and C. B. Renshaw (C., Renfrewshire West), a noted carpet manufacturer, who was chairman of the Caledonian Railway. Railways, however, had many board seats to fill and therefore sought directors from other businesses and professions. Twenty-three business MPs from other industries sat on railway boards among who were J. H. D. Ryder (C., Gravesend), John James Mellor (C., Lancashire–Radcliffe), and T. H. Sidebottom (C., Staleybridge). In total, of those who headed railways while serving in this Parliament, relatively few were involved in local politics, but many were involved in other businesses even while serving as railway heads. Few inherited honors or received honors, but if they were honored, it was rarely greater than a baronetage.

Eighteen businessmen in this Parliament headed shipping companies as their primary business occupation. These companies included some of the famous names of English shipping: Clan Line, Castle Line, Union Steamship, Moor Line, Anchor Line, and P. and O. Interestingly, ship owners only sat on four outside boards: Sigismund Mendl (Rad., Plymouth) on an insurance company board, Sir Albert K. Rollit (C., Islington South) on the National Telephone board, and Charles Wilson (L., Hull West) on the board of a railway and of the Hull Dock Company. Some of the more well-known of these ship owners were: Sir Charles W. Cayzer (C., Barrow-in-Furness), founder and chairman of the Clan line, Walter Runciman (L., Oldham), a partner with his father in Walter Runciman and Company, who, after extensive

government service, would be elevated to Viscount in the 1930s, Charles Wilson, Thomas Wilson and Sons, elevated to the peerage as Lord Nunburnholme in 1906; and Sir Thomas Sutherland, (L. U., Greenock), chairman, P. & O. Steamship Co. Of the eighteen involved in shipping, only four were on outside boards, one ship owner had been a mayor in the past, and most of the honors given to men in this field were knighthoods and baronets: five knighthoods, six baronets, and eight orders of honor: three KCMGs, one each CMG, GCMG, CB, KCB, GBE. While two peerages were granted to these men, one was created a third of a century later.

Railways and shipping required the extensive use of iron and steel. Ten MPs were partners, chairmen, or directors of iron or steel works among whom were Alfred Baldwin (see railways above), head of his family's firm E. P. & W. Baldwin, the largest steelworks in the United Kingdom, Laurence Hardy (C., Kent South, Ashford) chairman of Low Moor Ironworks, and Sir Alfred Hickman, (C., Wolverhampton West) chairman of Alfred Hickman, Ltd., steelmakers.

There were other businesses besides movement of goods and people that used iron and steel and there were eight businessmen in this Parliament who had been or were involved in these businesses. They included William Johnson Galloway (C., Manchester Southwest) who was a builder of fixed steam engines (used to power machinery in factories) who was also a director of Carnforth Iron and Hermatite Works, as well as a coal company, and William Kenrick (L. U., Birmingham North) whose family were hollowware producers. Kenrick served as mayor of Birmingham, following in the footsteps of his relative by marriage, Joseph Chamberlain (see

government above). Finally, Sir Fred Mappin, Bt., (L., Yorkshire, Hallamshire), chairman of Thomas Turton Sons, Ltd., a file, tool, and spring manufacturer. There will be more about these gentlemen chapter four.

Ten of our MPs were involved in various sectors of the shipbuilding industry. Five were shipbuilders, most notably Messrs. Harland and Wolff. Sir Edward J. Harland, Bt. created in 1886, (C. U., Belfast North) who had been Mayor of Belfast in 1885-1886, died in January 1896, while his business partner, Gustav W. Wolff (C., Belfast East), who at this time headed the Belfast Ropeworks, continued to sit in Parliament until 1910. There is more about the firm in Chapter four. Others included Sir Frederick Seager Hunt, Bt., (C., Maidstone), head of Seager Evans and Company (a distillery) who was also Chairman of Earl's Shipbuilding Company from 1896, and Joseph Richardson (L., Durham Southeast), four times Mayor of Stockton, who was part of the family that owned Richardson, Duck, and Company, shipbuilders. After amalgamating with others at the turn of the century, this company folded in 1925.

Five members were involved with marine engine builders. Two of these firms, Scotia Engine Works and T. Richardson and Sons merged, and the combined firm lasted until 1982.¹⁶ William Allan (Rad., Gateshead), knighted in 1902, was proprietor of Scotia Engine Works and Sir Thomas Richardson (L.U., Hartlepool), was head of T. Richardson and Sons.

Contractors in this Parliament included Sir Thomas Wrightson, Bt., (C., St. Pancras East), a civil engineer by training and founder of the bridge building firm of Head, Wrightson and Company, who was also chairman of Small Dwellings

Acquisition Company, of Cromlington Colliery, and a director of Northeastern Steel Company; and Sir William Arrol (L., Ayrshire South) who was also a bridge builder having built the Tay, Forth, and Tower Bridges. Wrightson's firm grew to 6,000 employees in 1968, but then a long decline set in leading to its closure in 1987,¹⁷ while Arrol's firm continued independently until it was acquired by Clarke Chapman in 1969, which in turn merged with other firms to form Northern Engineering Industries. Twelve years later, Rolls Royce bought this firm, held it eleven years and then sold it in 2000 to Langley Holdings.¹⁸ Two other contractors who were MPs in this Parliament, John Aird (C., Paddington North), mayor of Paddington in 1900, a contractor on public works, and Sir Weetman D. Pearson, Bt., a contractor involved in tunnels, bridges, and port facilities in the United Kingdom, United States, Mexico, and South America, are described in more detail in Chapter Four.

To summarize the above, often MPs in iron and steel production, none were elected to high local office, three were involved in other businesses, and they received one knighthood, three baronetages and two peerages. Of the twenty-five involved in businesses using iron and steel, eleven were associated with businesses outside their main business, six had been mayors, two of whom had had multiple terms. Joseph Richardson was four times Mayor of Stockton. Six knighthoods, nine baronetages, and one peerage were bestowed on these men.

Telegraphy and telephony were some of the cutting edge businesses of the time. Sir John Pender, KCMG 1888, GCMG 1892, (L. U., Wick), who had been a Manchester manufacturer, was an early backer of international telegraph cables,

backing the first and second Atlantic cables. Subsequently he built the Eastern Telegraph Company by laying cable through the Mediterranean and pushing the lines to Australia and then, through the China Telegraph Company, into the Pacific. After merger with the Marconi companies, these businesses would become Cable and Wireless.¹⁹ William St. John F. Brodrick (C., Surrey, Guildford), who in 1907 would succeed his father as ninth Viscount Midleton and then in 1920 be elevated as the first Earl Midleton, was an early, very successful, investor in telegraph cable companies. The Dictionary of National Biography describes his most important moment in the House of Commons as follows: "...It was he who, in opposition during the Liberal Government of 1892 to 1895, discovered the deficiency of ammunition for the army and inspired the motion which caused Rosebery's fall..."²⁰

William Quilter, a stockbroker listed above, was an early backer of the National Telephone Company, which became the surviving English telephone company after a number of mergers in the late 1880s. As a result of an 1880 case brought against a predecessor of National Telephone, courts determined that the Post Office had a right to 10% of telephone company revenues and a call option to purchase the assets of the company. In 1896, National's trunk lines were purchased for £460,000.²¹ Not one of these gentlemen was involved in government though one did have a significant impact on Parliamentary history. Honors associated with their business successes were limited to knighthoods and one baronetage, although the children and grandchildren of Sir John Pender would receive baronetages and

eventually a peerage. Broderick succeeded his father and would be elevated to an Earldom.

Sixteen MPs were associated with the brewery trade: G. H. Allsopp (C., Worcester), H. A. Bass (L., Staffordshire West), Henry C. O. Bonsor (C. Wimbledon), Sir Henry Bullard, (C., Norwich), Spencer Charrington (C., Tower Hamlets, Mile End), C. H. Combe (C., Chertsey), Sydney Evershed (L., Burton), who was involved in two breweries, Henry C. Fulford (L., Lichfield), John Gretton, Jr. (C., Derbyshire South), William McEwan (L., Edinburgh Central), Fred C. Rasch (C., Essex Southeast), John Rutherford, (C., Darwin), Thomas Skewes-Cox (C., Kingston), Francis Taylor (L.U., Norfolk South), Thomas Usborne (C. Essex-Mid) and Alfred M. Wigram (C., Essex South). Allsopp's, Fulford's and Rasch's brewing companies became part of Allied Brewers.²² Combe (Bonsor's and Combe's company), Wigram's Reid's Brewers and Skewes-Cox's Isleworth Brewery, all combined with Watneys.²³ Bullard's Anchor Brewery combined with Charrington's, which in turn combined with Bass (directed by Bass and Gretton).²⁴ One of Evershed's breweries merged with Marston and Thompson in 1909, the other was taken over by Vaux Breweries in the late 1940s,²⁵ and McEwan's is part of Scottish and Newcastle.²⁶ Usborn's Whittle Brown merged with Nuttals.²⁷ The fate of Rutherford's and Taylor's²⁸ breweries are unknown. In summary, the breweries of fourteen of the sixteen survived either independently or through mergers. Five brewers had been mayors, two of whom served more than one term, honors were few (no extensive beerage here) with two knighthoods, a baronetage, and one peerage.

Five members of Parliament were distillers. Sir Frederick Seager - Hunt, Bt., created in 1892 (C., Stowe - Mid) was head of Seager Evans and Company. Founded in 1805 and originally gin manufacturers, the company expanded by buying Scotch distilleries. In 1956 they were bought by Schenley which itself subsequently has been absorbed and traded by others.²⁹ John E. Jameson (APIN, Clare West), of the Jameson Irish Whiskey distillery family, previously in the military, now was manager of the business. Jamesons continued independently until merged in 1966 with John Power and the Cork Distillery to form Irish Distillers, which now is owned by Pernod-Ricard.³⁰ Finally, Samuel Young (APIN, Cavan East), was head of Young King and Company, whiskey distillers of Belfast, which was bought by United Distillers in 1914.³¹ Of these five distillers at least three sold out with two of the resulting firms being traceable to today (Schneley, and Irish Distillers.) Outside business interests seem to be limited to one shipbuilder and Belfast's largest baker. One baronet was the only honor received.

Utilities include waterworks, gas works and electrical distribution. Edmund Boulnois (C. Marylebone East), was chairman of West Middlesex Waterworks, and T. D. Bolton (L. Derbyshire-Northeast), was a director of Worksop Waterworks. The head of Ipswich Gas Light, Daniel F. Goddard (L., Ipswich), an articled civil engineer, was a member of this Parliament, as was James Francis Xavier O'Brien (APIN, Cork County), Secretary to the Cork Gasworks who had studied medicine in Ireland and Paris, but became an Irish tea and wine importer. After agitating for Irish

independence, he was convicted of treason in 1867. His death sentence was commuted to life in prison, and eventually he was released in a general pardon.

Utilities often had prominent local businessmen on their boards or overseeing the company. Among our parliamentarians, seven of eight MPs affiliated with utilities were involved in other businesses. Three of these MPs had been mayors, one had been convicted of treason, and one would be knighted.

Twenty-three MPs were involved with coal mining including three of the five Peases, Sir Charles Palmer, Bt., (L., Jarrow), who also was in iron and steel, and Sir James Joicey, Bt. (L., Durham Chester - le - Street.) A coal merchant of particular interest was David A. Thomas (L., Merthyr Tydvil.) First elected to Parliament in 1888, he had sought government office but by 1910 had not reached it and so retired from politics and returned to the colliery business in Wales. He was quite successful. But the First World War changed all, and at the request of the government he acted as munitions minister in the United States arranging the purchase of supplies. He received a peerage with the title Viscount Rhondda.

Collieries were often associated with iron and steel production, with at least seven of the MPs having connections to both businesses. Other outside business interests of those involved in collieries included several banks, a newspaper, pottery company, and flourmill. The extent of the non-Parliamentary political activity of these men before the First World War seems to have been limited. A substantial number of honors were given to these businessmen, though not necessarily for their achievements in the colliery trade. Three were baronets, six would become baronets

(one by succession), and four would be elevated into the peerage. One peerage was granted for activities in businesses other than collieries (Herbert Pease) and one for war work (Rhondda).

Merchant is a broad term that can be used to cover a variety of businesses: foreign trade, for which England had long been noted, food and provisions, those who merchandised that which they fashion, and retailers. Forty-eight of the MPs in this Parliament described themselves as merchant.

A foreign merchant is one who imports, exports, or trades products between other countries. Ten MPs in this Parliament were in foreign trade. Of note was Gibbs and Company, a well-known firm that had had a very successful run as importers from Peru of guano. By the time of this Parliament that business had disappeared as the Peruvians had given preference to local firms, and Gibbs was evolving toward a banking model, though still active in trade. By the late twentieth century, when the firm was bought, insurance brokerage had become its specialty. There will be more about the firm in chapter four. A. G. H. Gibbs (C., City of London), elevated to the peerage in 1907, and Vicary Gibbs (C., St Albans), trained as a barrister and who had number other business directorships in colonial land companies and insurance, were members of the family and the firm. Among numerous other MPs and their firms dealing in foreign trade were: John E. Barlow (L., Frome), a barrister by training, who was a partner in T. Barlow and Brothers of Manchester, London, Calcutta, Shanghai, and Singapore; Sir William Dunn, Bt., (L., Paisley) head of William Dunn and Company with offices and outposts in London, East London, Port Elizabeth, and

Durban; and William Keswick, (C. Epsom and Ewell), member of Jardine, Matheson, china merchants.

Four of our MPs were involved in the tea trade, but of most interest is Hudson Eubank Kearly. After working for Tetley and Sons, Ltd., he started his own business, Hesseltine and Kearly, which evolved into International Tea Stores. He would be created Baronet in 1908, and eventually elevated to the peerage. There is more on him in chapter four. Three members, Bernard Collery (APIN, Sligo), mayor Sligo 1882 and 1884, Charles Gold (Rad., Essex Saffron Waldon), and James Galloway (L., Ross and Cromarty) were, (or in Galloway's case, had been until retirement in 1880) in the wine importation business. Other food and provision merchants included Sir Reginald Hanson, Bt., knighted 1882, baronet 1887, (C., City of London), former Lord Mayor of London, wholesale grocer, Hanson, Son, and Company; Matthew Fowler (L., Durham City), provision merchant, and Jonathon Samuel (L., Stockton-on-Tees), mayor, J. Samuel confectionaries and preserves.

Among the others classified as merchants was Evelyn Hubbard (C., Lambeth, Bruxton), partner in Hubbard and Company, director Bank of England, and chairman Guardian Assurance Company from 1900 on. Two MPs were in the timber trade: Batty Langley (L., Sheffield Attercliffe), and John H. Roberts (C., Denbighshire West), Baronet 1908, peerage 1919. Two were in the leather trade, Alfred LaFone (C. U., Southwark - Bermondsey), senior partner Boutcher, Martunes, and Co. leather factors; and William L. Jackson (C., Leeds North), leather tanner and merchant.

There were eleven Irish members who called themselves merchants including Sir Thomas Lea, Bt. created 1892, (L., Londonderry South), chairman of Lea, Ltd. of Kidderminster; James Gilhooly (APIN, Bantry) draper; and Jeremiah Jordan (APIN, Fermanagh South), provision merchant and farmer. All told, these forty-eight merchants, involved in a wide variety of business endeavors, had between them at least eight mayors, one knighthood, two MPs who were given membership in orders, five baronets and, four who were elevated into a peerage.

News publication had become a major business since the middle of the century. The development of the steam rotary press and the removal of the 'taxes on knowledge,' facilitated this growth. Ten MPs in this Parliament were involved with newspapers and periodicals. Among these MPs were Sir Algernon Borthwick, Bt, (C. Kensington South) proprietor of the *Morning Post* who received a baronetage in 1887 and was elevated to a peerage as Baron Glenesk in 1895, before he could take his seat in the Commons; Sir John A. Willox, (C., Liverpool East) proprietor and editor of the *Liverpool Courier*; and Sir James Joicey, Bt., a colliery owner, who also owned the *Newcastle Daily Leader*. Thomas G. Bowles (C., Lynn Regis), who had been a clerk at Inland Revenue, and a correspondent for the *Morning Post*, founded, owned, and edited the magazine *Vanity Fair* from 1868 on. Last, Henry H. Marks (C., Tower Hamlets - St George's in the East) was chairman of Argus Printing Company and founder, owner, and editor of the *Financial News*. In total, of these ten MPs, four had other business interests, none had been mayors, and these MPs would receive of three knighthoods, two baronetages and two peerages.

Under the heading ‘other’ were printers and publishers in addition to Henry Marks, mentioned above. An example is Hugh Oakley Arnold Forster (L. U., West Belfast), the grandson of Thomas Arnold of Rugby and nephew of Matthew Arnold. When his parents died he and his siblings went to live with his father’s sister, Jane Martha, and her husband, W. E. Forster. Arnold Forster, as he was known, became a barrister (after attending Rugby, of course, and Oxford) and in his twenties became private secretary to his stepfather Forster in Gladstone’s second government. In 1885 Arnold Forster joined Cassel and Company, publishers, where he produced a series of handbooks promoting ‘wise patriotism.’ In 1900 he chaired a commission on land settlements, then became spokesman for the Navy in the House of Commons, and, in 1903, Secretary of State for War. Among the five other MPs, involved in printing and publishing was Richard K. Causton (L., Southward West), whose family continued to run Sir Joseph Causton and Sons until the early 1960s. All told, of seven (including Marks) printers and publishers, two had been or would be in national government, one was a mayor twice, two had outside business interests, and two had trained as barristers. One of the MPs honored with a knighthood and one would be raised to the peerage within a decade.

Three were hotel proprietors, P. J. O’Brien (APIN, Tipperary North), James Bailey, knighted in 1906 (C., Walworth), and Joseph Hemlock Wilson (see labour above), who founded a temperance hotel in Sunderland.

Manufacturers in the ‘Other’ category in Table 36 are those who produce goods but not the previously mentioned cloth, iron and steel, shipbuilding, and engine

manufacturing. First, three were in other forms of cloth trade. James Alfred Jacoby, (L., Derbyshire Mid), was a lace manufacturer in Nottingham and, through related firms, in Germany, under the company name M. Jacoby and Company; George Kemp, (L. U., Lancashire Heywood) was a flannel manufacturer, and Charles Morley (L. Breconshire) was a partner in I. R. Morley, Hosiers. Other manufacturers included Victor Milward (C., Stratford on Avon), a director of Henry Milward and Sons, Ltd., a needle manufacturer as well as a director of Metropolitan Life Assurance Society, Philip A. Muntz, son of G. F. Muntz in our previous Parliament, (C., Tamworth) owner of Muntz Metal, and Sir John J. Jenkins (L. U. Carwarthen) tin plate manufacturer who was also chairman of Harbour Trust and of a railway.

MPs involved in 'heavy' industries included Sir John T. Brunner, Bt., (L., Cheshire - Norwich), co-founder of Brunner-Mond, the world's largest alkali works; Thomas D. Bolton, (L., Derbyshire Northeast) chairman of Neuchâtel Asphalt Company, Richard Pilkington (C. U., Newton), glass manufacturer and four times mayor of St. Helens, and Sir John Benjamin Stone, (C., Birmingham East), a partner in Stone, Fawdry, and Stone, glass manufacturers and four time mayor of Sutton Coldfield. Stone also invested in paper manufacturing, and two other MPs had interests in paper, Thomas Owen (L., Cornwall) owner of Thomas Owen and Company, Bath Paper Mills, and Evans and Owen Newsprint manufacturers; and Robert W. Perks, (L., Lincolnshire - Louth) a solicitor involved in many businesses, who was a partner in Ely Paper Works.

Among others identified as being in manufacturing businesses were Sir John Blundell Maple, Bt., (C., Dulwich), carpet manufacturer, who left £2,153,000 in 1903 to his daughter; William Woodall (L., Hanley) senior partner of James McIntyre Pottery and chairman of a colliery company; and Herbert Shepherd-Cross, (C., Bolton), a partner with his brother in Mountfield Bleaching Works. In total, of nineteen businessmen MPs in heavy manufacturing, at least eleven had business interests outside their own companies, three had been mayors, in all cases for multiple terms, six were or would be knighted, three created baronets, and one would be elevated to a peerage.

Several members' businesses produced consumer goods. Robert Cox (C. U., Edinburgh South) was sole owner at J. and G. Cox, gelatin and glue manufacturers; George William Palmer (L., Reading), former Mayor of Reading, was director of his family's bakery, Palmers; and Sir William Henry Wills, Bt, (Rad., Bristol East), was chair of W. D and H. O. Wills, Ltd., tobacconist, predecessor to British Tobacco. Of the eight MPs whose businesses were involved in consumer goods manufacturing, only three occupied seats on the boards of outside businesses, and between them they had one mayoralty, and were granted one baronetage.

Besides all that is listed before, human needs include many other business opportunities. Transportation of goods - railways and shipping - create other business opportunities besides supplying the iron and steel used in the production of ships, railways, and engines, and the coal used in powering the engines. An earlier form of internal United Kingdom transit were canals, which continued to have advantages for

moving heavy bulk items with relatively little energy expended. Clement M. Royds (U., Rochdale) chairman of Williams and Deacon Bank was also chairman of Rochdale Canal Company. Additionally, three others sat on canal company boards.

Ships need locations to tie up and load and unload. Sir John Jones Jenkins, Charles Wilson, Robert W. Perks, and Sir Thomas Sutherland were heads of, founders of, or directors of harbour and dock companies. Dredging often is necessary to keep harbors open, and Perks was also chairman of Barge and Dredging Company. Items shipped by sea or rail often have to be stored in the course of their journey. George Edward Baines (C., West Hampshire South), Frederick Lucas Cook, (C., Lambeth), and James Kenyon (see cotton above), were warehousemen or, in Kenyon's case, chairman of a storage company.

Of course, people also traveled on trains and ships. One of the most notable companies catering to the traveling public was W. H. Smith, newsagents. William Frederick Danvers Smith (L. Strand), who succeeded his mother as second Viscount Hambleden in 1913, was the only surviving son of W. H. Smith (who had been active in previous governments). W. F. D. Smith's grandfather had founded the business which his father had greatly expanded. In 1905, W. F. D. would take the company in a new direction, into retail stores, after losing contracts with two railways.

Another business in the "other" category is real estate. W. J. Galloway, of the engine building business, was also vice-president of the Claremont Park Land Building Company; A. E. Pease, and Sir J. W. Pease, were respectively managing

director and chairman of the Middleborough Estate Company, Ltd.; and T. C. T. Warner (see railways above) who was chairman of Warner Estate Company.

To summarize the forgoing information, eighty-eight of the 287 businessmen MPs were involved with more than one business in their career. This is 30.7 % of these men. These eighty-eight were involved in 136 different businesses, which means that some were involved in three or more. Examples of these men include Sir Henry H. Bemrose, head of a printing company, director of Parrs bank, and of Linotype Company; Sir James Kitson, chairman of Yorkshire Banking Company, owner of Airedale Foundry, and director of the Northeastern railway; and Sir Thomas Sutherland, a founder of Hong Kong Docks, a founder of Hong Kong and Shanghai Banking Corporation, chairman of P. and O. Shipping Line, chairman of Marine and General Assurance Society, director of London City and Midland Bank, and director of the Suez Canal Company. Forty-one of these businessmen MPs had been mayors of their hometowns and many, if not most, of the remainder had held various other positions as aldermen, town counselors, sheriffs, magistrates or justices of the peace.

Below is Table 37 which shows those who were involved in business, not exclusively, but rather in addition to their other, main, employment. These business activities usually were directorships, but could also include a previous experience.

Table 37

Parliament of 1895-1900, Outside Directorships of Other MPs

		Bank	Ins	Fin	Ship	RW	Cotton	Wool & Linen	Steel	Const	Ship-Bldg	Tele	Brew	Dist	Util	Call	News Pub	Other	Total
Land	3	1	1			1			1									2	6
Govt	12	3	2	2	1	5						2					1	4	20
Mili	6	1				2			2								1	1	7
Barr	17	2	1	1		7								1	1		2	5	20
Sal	6	2	1			1						1				1	1	3	10
MD	3									1							1	1	3
Writ/ Jour	3			1								1					1	2	5
Lab	5			1													1	2	4
Other	3					1												2	3
Acad	1																	1	1
Total	59	9	5	5	1	17			3	1		4		1	1	1	8	23	

[Sources: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900, The Dictionary of National Biography, Boase's Modern English Biography, Boylan's Dictionary of Irish Biography, the British Biographical Archive: Seventeenth through the Nineteenth Centuries, and the Dictionary of Business Biography.]

To read this table, the column on the tables left as we look at it lists the non-business professions represented in this Parliament. The second column is the number of members of that non-business profession who had business interests or board memberships outside their main profession. The remainder of the columns indicate the number of interests in the previously identified business fields. Thus, I have identified three landholders as having sat on one bank board, one insurance company board, one railway, one steel company, and two other company's boards. Twelve involved in government sat on at least 20 boards that I have been able to identify including three banks, five railways and four in the 'other' category.

From the above table we can see that railways, banks, and insurance companies had many MPs from other employment categories. Sometimes these directors might be chosen because of their personal connection to the company or because of their expertise. Barristers and solicitors have specialized knowledge, of course, and those in government may have been sought because of their connections within the political establishment and the government bureaucracy.

Among those listed under the heading government who had business interests were Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, GCB, 1895, (L., Sterling), who had formerly been an active member of the family company, J. and W. Campbell and Company, warehousemen and drapers, and Sir Henry Fowler (L., Wolverhampton East), previously President of the Local Government Board in 1892 and Secretary for India in 1894. In 1897 he became a director of National Telephone, and within four years was president of the company. It may be that he was asked to join the board so that the company, which as we have seen had a complex relationship with the government, could have a strong link to the Liberal party to broaden its political connections. National's other directors in this Parliament were Quilter, a Liberal Unionist, and Rollit, a Conservative. Another example of a former government minister joining a railway board is Sir Edward Grey, Bt., KG, 1912, Viscount Fallodon, 1916, (L., Northumberland, Berwick-on-Tweed). While he is most noted for his service as head of the Foreign Office from 1905 to 1916, following the Liberal defeat in 1895 Grey joined the board of the Northeastern Railway, and in 1904, became chairman of it. Conservative politicians also joined corporate boards. Sir

Matthew White Ridley, Bt., created Viscount Ridley and Baron Wensleydale in 1900, went on the board of the Northeastern Railway, assumed its chairmanship in 1902 but died in 1904, opening the way for Grey.

Among lawyers with business interests were Timothy C. Harrington, (Parnellite, Dublin Harbour), a barrister, who helped devise the 'Plan of Campaign' (the attempt to force renegotiation of rents on Irish estates owned by absentee landlords), was counsel to Parnell, Mayor of Dublin several times, and founder and part owner of the *Kerry Sentinel* until he sold his interest to his brother, and Irwin Edward B. Cox, (C., Middlesex, Harrow), barrister, Middle Temple, landholder of about 2000 acres, and publisher of three magazines, The Field, Queen, and Law Times. Another solicitor with outside business interests was Charles Harrison (L., Plymouth), director of Legal and General Life Assurance Society.

That union men are listed may surprise some, but it really shouldn't. Richard McGhee, (APIN and Labour, Louth South), the founder of the Glasgow Dockers Union, was a commission agent; Frederick Maddison, (Radical, Sheffield Brightside), who had worked as a compositor, founded and edited the *Railway Review*, an employee's paper; and William Charles Steadman, (L., Tower Hamlets), who had been secretary to the Barge Builders Trades Union since 1879, and was a representative to the London Trades Union Council, was also the chairman of the investment committee of the Hearts of Oak Benefit Society.

John Dillon, an Irish surgeon, had served an apprenticeship with a cotton broker; and Joseph E. Kenny, physician and surgeon, was a founder of the *Daily Irish*

Independent newspaper (precursor to today's *Irish Independent*.) William L. Ashmead Bartlett Burdett-Coutts, (C. Westminster), husband of Baroness Burdett-Coutts, who was long active in supporting her charitable ventures, was a founder of the Imperial British East Africa Company (IBEAC). The one MP in the education category was Owen Morgan Edwards, (Welsh Nationalist, Merionethshire), listed above who was a lecturer in history at Lincoln College, Oxford, and publisher of books and magazines oriented toward Welsh nationalism.

Finally, not otherwise noted immediately above, were four government ministers in this administration who had had extensive business experience in their past. Charles Thompson Ritchie, (C. Croydon), who had been active in his family's business, William Ritchie and Sons, jute merchants, was President of the Board of Trade, George J. Goschen, (L. U., St George, Hanover Square), formerly a banker, was First Lord of the Admiralty, R. W. Hanbury, (C., Preston), retired from managing his lands and mines, was now Financial Secretary to the Treasury, and would become President of the Board of Agriculture, 1900-1903, and last, the most famous of these, Joseph Chamberlain (L. U., Birmingham West), long retired from his former firm of Nettlefolds and Chamberlain, screw and nail manufacturers, and now the leader of the Liberal Unionists, Colonial Secretary and Cabinet member in this Parliament.

To conclude, the 287 business MPs elected to this Parliament of 1895-1900 represented a wide variety of businesses: banking, other financial activities of various types, shipping, railways, fabrics, iron, steel, coal, brewing, distilling, ship building, construction, utilities, publishing, merchandizing and a variety of other

fields. They held at least 136 board seats or identifiable interests in businesses other than their own. Many served in local political offices including 41 serving as mayors, sometimes for multiple terms. They were joined by fifty-nine other MPs from other professions who served on boards of a variety of different lines of business.

Chamberlain is just one example of a powerful local businessman leading the community in which he lived. Many MPs had been Justices of the Peace and county magistrates, town counselors and Sheriffs. Examples include George Doughty (L. U., Great Grimsby), twice mayor of Great Grimsby, Sydney Evershed (L. Burton) twice mayor of Burton, Sir Arthur Forwood (C., Lancashire S.W.) former mayor of Liverpool, three of the Peases had served as mayor of Darlington, Sir Reginald Hanson served a term as Lord Mayor of London, and Sir Edward J. Harland had been mayor of Belfast. Most of the businessmen elected to Parliament had businesses that were deeply involved in their localities. Doughty, Evershed, Forwood, Harland, Palmer, and the Peases, among many others in this Parliament, dominated their localities through their ownership of businesses, factories, and real estate. Further, many sat on local boards such as chambers of commerce, school boards, and other church and civic endeavors. Thus, the House of Commons, in its business membership, still contained a local elite, just not the aristocratic one of the past.

Characteristics of the businessmen compared to their compatriots in Parliament.

Education of the Members of the House of Commons.

The education of the members of this Parliament can be determined by a review of the information they provided in Dod's, any information available in the other sources that have been used such as the Dictionary of National Biography, the various dictionaries of business biography, and the British Bibliographical Archive.

Table 38
Secondary Education of MPs in The Parliament of 1895 – 1900, by Percentage

Profession	Clarendon Schools	Other Public Schools	Other	Unknown
Government Service	69.4	8	8	15.6
Land Ownership	67.1	4.3	12.9	15.7
Military	52.2	13	14.5	20.3
Education	33.3	25	33.3	8.4
Barrister	31.5	12.7	41.2	14.5
Writer/Journalist	29.4	11.8	29.4	29.4
Other	20.6	11.8	41.2	26.5
Business	19.4	10.1	49.7	19.8
Solicitor	9	9	73	9
Medical Doctor	8	8	54	32
Labour	0	0	64.7	35.3

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900.]

Table 38 shows that the Clarendon schools (Eton, Harrow, Winchester, Westminster, Rugby, Charterhouse, St. Pauls, Shrewsbury, and Merchant Tailor) dominated the education of the MPs in this Parliament who were the traditional political and governmental leaders of Britain, those in government service, the military or who held land. Those who used words, educators, journalists and writers, and barristers, were also often graduates of Clarendon or other public schools. Those who fall in the category of 'other,' come next in order in their attendance at Clarendon Schools, followed by business, then, in much smaller numbers, solicitors and MDs. But no labour representative attended public schools.

To go into greater detail, forty-six percent of those classified as ‘Government Service’ attended Eton, twelve percent Harrow, eight percent Rugby, and two percent Westminster. The other public and grammar schools for this classification included King’s College School, London, Cheltenham, and Edgbaston. Among those classified as ‘landed,’ fifty-two percent attended Eton, thirteen percent Harrow, and one percent each at Westminster and Charterhouse. Other schools included Wellington, Cheltenham, and Edgbaston. Nearly thirty-five percent of those in the ‘Military’ attended Eton, nine percent at Rugby, four percent Harrow, three percent Winchester, and one percent Shrewsbury. Other schools included Kings College School, Wellington, Cheltenham, Marlborough, Edinburgh Academy, and Edgbaston.

Those who subsequently became educators had over sixteen percent attending Eton, over eight percent at both Rugby and Charterhouse, with smaller percentages at other schools including University College School, London, and Liverpool. For Barristers, nearly thirteen percent attended Eton, nearly seven percent Harrow, three percent each at Rugby and Westminster, over two percent at Winchester, two percent at Shrewsbury and one percent at Merchant Tailor. Other public schools identified attended by barristers included University College School and Kings College School, both of London, Cheltenham, Marlborough, Haileybury, Edinburgh High School, and Edinburgh Academy. Almost twelve percent of writers and journalists attended Eton and Harrow, with Shrewsbury at almost six percent.

Nine percent of those classified as ‘Others’ attended Eton, six percent Harrow, three percent Rugby, with Wellington, Cheltenham, and Marlborough also

represented. We will go into business in greater detail below. One might wonder why so few of the medical doctors in this Parliament attended Clarendon Schools. The answer is that a high percentage of the doctors were from Ireland and had attended Catholic schools there. Of the solicitors, only Rugby and Winchester had parliamentarians from their ranks.

We will break down the classification of business for more detail (Table 39):

Table 39
Secondary Education of Business Parliamentarians
In the Parliament of 1895-1900
By Percentage

Occupation	Clarendon Schools	Other Public Schools	Other Schools	Unknown
Banker	45.0	17.5	20.0	17.5
Insurance	-	-	100	-
Other Finance	23.5	17.6	41.2	17.6
Shipping	4.2	4.2	70.8	20.8
Railways	27.6	6.9	37.9	27.6
Cotton	5.3	10.5	57.9	26.3
Wool/Linen	9.1	9.1	54.5	27.3
Merchant	10.4	29.2	18.8	41.6
Steel/Iron	4.3	17.5	56.5	21.7
Construction	-	12.5	37.5	50.0
Marine Eng.	11.1	33.3	55.5	-
Telecom	50.0	-	50.0	-
Utility	-	-	50.0	-
Brewer	56.3	-	31.2	12.5
Distiller	40.0	20.0	40.0	-
Colliery	25.0	16.7	50.0	8.3
Pub./Printer	22.2	-	66.7	11.1
Other	1.8	3.6	45.5	49.1

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900.]

As one can discern from the chart above, it is in 'old' businesses, banking, brewing, distilling, shipbuilding/marine engineering, colliers, and other finance that the percentage of public school attendee begins to approach that of government

leaders, the landed, and those who fight. Using table 38 above, if one combines Clarendon and other public schools, those in government totaled 77.4% public school attendees, landed 71.4%, military 65.2%, education 58.3%, barristers 44.2%, and writers and journalists 41.2%. Table 39 immediately above shows 62.5% of bankers attended public schools, 60% of distillers, 56.3% of brewers, over 44 % of shipbuilders and marine engineers, 41.7% of colliery owners, and 41.1% of those in other finance. Thus bankers fall near the military in public school attendance, brewers and distillers have an attendance rate nearly 90% of the military and in excess of the academics and well ahead of the barristers. Coal company owners and those in other financials are not far behind barristers. Those associated with railways were the only other classifications where public school attendance was fairly high.

Among the bankers, twenty percent were Eton graduates, over seventeen percent had been at Harrow, with Rugby, Winchester, and Charterhouse at about three percent each. Other schools included Tottenham and Cheltenham. Among brewers, Eton led with thirty-three percent, Harrow twenty percent, and Winchester about seven percent, while distillers had Harrow and Westminster at twenty percent each with Wimbledon being the other public school. Shipbuilding's public schools were Harrow, Tottenham, Rossal, and Edinburgh Academy. Colliery owners attended Eton, Harrow, Winchester, Tottenham, and Clifton. Other finance had nearly nineteen percent from Eton, six from Rugby, with Edinburgh Academy, City of London School and Royal Liverpool also represented. Eton led among those involved in Railways with nearly sixteen percent, Rugby at seven, Harrow at three.

Table 40
Percentage of each Professional Category of the
Members of the House of Commons in the Parliament of 1895-1900
who attended a University.

Profession	Ox.	Cam.	Trinity Dublin	Edin- burgh	Other Scots	Other Irish	Lon- don	Other English	For- eign	Mili- tary
Land	36.0	21.3	-	-	-	1.3	2.7	-	-	-
Govt. Serv.	42.0	28.0	-	2.0	2.0	-	-	-	4.0	-
Military	16.4	7.5	-	-	-	-	1.5	-	-	23.9
Barrister	37.8	29.7	8.7	5.2	5.8	4.7	9.9	-	7.6	-
Solicitor	-	4.5	4.5	-	-	4.5	18.2	-	4.5	-
M. D.	-	-	7.7	23.1	7.7	53.8	15.4	-	38.5	-
Academic	27.3	18.2	-	18.2	9.1	-	9.1	-	18.2	-
Writer	17.6	17.6	11.8	-	-	5.9	17.6	-	5.9	-
Labor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	30.3	21.7	-	-	-	3	-	-	9.1	-
Business	8.7	14.3	-	1.4	3.1	1.0	4.9	1.0	8.7	.3

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900.]

In Table 40 above we see, first, the percentage of the barristers attending University totals over 109 percent and of the medical doctors over 138 percent. This reflects graduate work at a university different from their undergraduate work. Of the 172 barristers, only 10 appear not to have attended university, but, on the other hand, a number of them attended more than one university, often in different countries. For example, William Ambrose, T. M Healy, and Earnest Spencer do not appear to have attended university; however Alexander Asher attended Aberdeen and Edinburgh, H. F. Bowles attended both Cambridge and Oxford, Arthur R. D. Elliot attended Edinburgh and Cambridge, and Charles B. B. McLaren attended Edinburgh, Bonn, and Heidelberg. In the case of the doctors, the thirteen doctors who were Members of this Parliament attended eighteen different universities.

If we rank these professions by attendance at Oxford and Cambridge, Government ranks first at 70%, barristers at 67.7%, landholders at 57.3% 'other' at 52%, academic at 45.5%, writers and journalists at 35.2% military at 23.9% and business at 23%. If we rank by total university attendance, MDs rank first, barristers second, academic third at 100%, government at 78%, writers at 76.4%, 'other' at 64.1%, landholders at 61.3%, military at 49.3%, and business at 43.4%.

Table 41 looks at businessmen's university attendance in detail:

Table 41
Disaggregation of the business category in Table 40

Profession	Oxford	Camb.	Trinity Dublin	Edin- burgh	Other Scots	Other Irish	Lon- don	Other English	For- eign	Mili- tary
Bank	20.0	30.0	-	-	3.3	-	6.7	-	10	-
Insurance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Fin.	7.7	23.1	-	7.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Shipping	16.7	11.1	-	-	5.6	-	16.7	-	11.1	-
Railway	33.3	11.1	-	-	-	-	-	11.1	11.1	-
Cotton	5.6	-	-	11.1	5.6	-	16.7	5.6	11.1	-
Wool/Linen	12.5	-	-	-	12.5	-	-	-	12.5	-
Merchant	10.4	6.3	-	-	7.3	-	2.0	-	-	-
Steel	7.7	7.7	-	-	-	-	7.7	-	7.7	-
Construct.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Marine E.	-	22.2	-	11.1	-	-	-	-	33.3	-
Telecom	50.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brewery	-	20.0	-	-	6.7	-	6.7	-	-	-
Distillery	-	40.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20.0
Utility	-	50.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Colliery	8.3	33.3	-	-	8.3	-	-	8.3	-	-
News Pub.	5.3	-	-	-	-	10.5	5.3	-	-	-
Other	5.5	20.0	-	-	-	2.0	2.0	-	-	9.9

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900.]

Not all businessmen had the same experiences or upbringing. If we rank these different business professions by their attendance at Oxford or Cambridge, bankers rank first at 50%, seemingly tied with telecom at 50%, however telecom consists of only four, thus the percentage is based on a extremely small sample. If we rank these categories by the total attendance at university, bankers rank first at 70%, railway and

shipbuilding /marine engineering are both at 66.6%, ship owners at 61.2%, distillers at 60%, and colliery owners at 59.2%.

If we compare the education of business disaggregated in table 41 to the previous table, 40, banking, at 50% Oxbridge and 70% overall, was not particularly out of line with some of the more educated in the categories of all MPs, ranking between 'other' and academic when ranked by Oxbridge and close to landholders in this ranking, and in total attendance between writers/journalists and 'other.' Interestingly, by this time bankers rank well ahead of landholders and military in total university attendance.

Railway associated businessmen, colliery owners and managers, and distillers are well educated and rank fairly highly. Construction, has no university men in its ranks, news publication, steel manufacturing, and 'other' have few.

To summarize, the education of businessmen was not uniform across the 287 businessmen, rather the 'old' business professions of banking, finance, shipping, and the new business of railways were populated with well-educated businessmen, whereas many of the businessmen in other lines of work had not had the same secondary school opportunities.

Club Memberships

Another way of analyzing the nature of the membership of this Parliament is to look at the non-political gentlemen's club affiliations of the members. The Carlton Club, Junior Carlton, City Carlton, Conservative, Constitutional, Junior

Constitutional, and City Constitutional Clubs (with the Carlton being the senior and by far the largest) were the political clubs of the Conservatives. The Liberals had the Reform, National Liberal, City Liberal, and Devonshire. However, in addition, and in some cases much older, were a series of clubs, sometimes more loosely affiliated with the parties, but much more social and exclusive. Whites, Brooks's, and Boodles were old eighteenth century clubs, Arthur's very early nineteenth century; Whites having been Tory and Brooks Whig in orientation. Other later nineteenth century social clubs included St. Stephens, St. James's, Bachelors, Garrick, Wellington, Bath, Marlborough, Windham, Turf, Savage, Pratts, Orleans, 80, and a country club, Hurlingham. There were clubs oriented to the educated: University, New University, Oxford and Cambridge, United University; and to the traveled and intellectual: Travelers, Saville, and the Athenaeum. The military had its clubs: Guards, Cavalry, Army and Navy, Naval and Military, United Service, and Junior United Service. Since almost all of the members of the Parliament belonged to one or another of the political clubs (the notable exceptions being most Irish members and most labour members), a detailed look at the non-political club memberships may reveal a great deal about the social acceptance of different professions.

First the clubs must be divided into categories: Military, University, Intellectual and Traveled, Social, and Top Level Social. Military, University, and Intellectual are taken directly from the list above. However, the social clubs require a little more work. Arthur's, while ancient by this time seems to have been in decline, and, indeed, it closed at the time of the Second World War and its Clubhouse was

take over by the Carlton. On the other hand, a later club, the Turf, seems to have developed a great deal of cachet. Perhaps that is to be expected of a club dedicated to racing. In any case, Table 42 has Social including all of the social clubs except Whites, Brooks's, Boodles, and Turf., which are listed as Upper Level Social.

Table 42
Non-Political Club Memberships by Profession/
Income Category in percentage terms

	Gov't	Land	Mili- tary	Barr.	Solic.	M.D.	Writer	Acad.	Other	Labor	Bus.
Clubs:											
Military	10.2	5.6	49.3	2.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.8
University	8.2	4.2	1.4	18.0	-	8.0	11.8	16.7	2.9	-	4.9
Intell./travel	24.5	15.3	4.3	21.5	9.0	8.0	23.5	33.3	11.8	-	5.2
Social	53.1	34.7	50.7	29.4	9.0	-	11.8	8.3	23.5	-	33.5
Upper Level Social	34.7	36.1	39.1	13.6	4.5	-	5.9	16.7	23.5	-	11.1

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900.]

What jumps out in the above chart is that, as one might expect, military men join military oriented clubs in high numbers and intellectuals (educators and writers / journalists) as well as barristers and members of the government joined intellectually oriented clubs. More interesting is that such high percentage of the military as well as those in government, exceeding those solely land oriented, joined social and upper level social clubs. Further, those in the 'other' professional category seem to also be especially socially oriented, particularly in the upper level social clubs. This may be result of a large number of 'other' being rentiers. As we have noted before among the 'Other' category are A. H. E. Allhusen and Thomas Fielden, both who inherited great wealth. Also several engineers were in the 'other' category and that may explain the relatively high percentage of such members in intellectually oriented clubs.

Businessmen seem to mirror barrister membership in military, social, and upper level social club memberships, but with many fewer university club and intellectually oriented club members.

However, as we saw with the public school attendance, some parts of the business community may be closer to the landed and military than other parts. If we disaggregate the business category in Table 42 we get the results in Table 43:

Table 43
Non-Political Club Memberships of businessmen disaggregated
By Professions

	Bankers	Bankers and Financiers	Other Business
Clubs:			
Military	6.7	4.8	.4
University	6.7	8.1	4.0
Intellectual/travel	20.0	11.3	3.6
Social	47.0	38.7	32.0
Upper Level Social	23.3	25.8	7.1

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900.]

These results show that if we compare the bankers and the bankers and financiers to those on the previous table, 42, bankers and bankers and financiers rank not far behind those in the government, the military, and the landed; just ahead of the 'other' classification; and well beyond those in the barrister and academic classification. The result of removing the bankers and financiers is that the rest of the businessmen fall to somewhere closer to the solicitors in their 'clubbyness' though with a great deal more social club connection.

Honors

Mentioned above was the honors earned by the businessmen who sat in this parliament. Those honors can be compared to the honors bestowed upon MPs in the other professional categories. Knighthoods listed below (Table 44) included Knights Bachelor, as well as a knighthood through one of the Orders of Chivalry of the United Kingdom: Garter, Thistle, Saint Patrick, Bath, Star of India, Saints Michael and George, British Empire, Indian Empire, Crown of India, and, in 1896, a new order, the Victorian Order.³²

Table 44
Those members of different Professions in the Parliament
of 1895-1900 who received Honors

	Knighthood	Baronetage	Peerage
Businessmen	55	57	32
Government	11	9	25
Military	18	11	15
Landholders	4	17	18
Barrister	38	23	27
Solicitor	0	0	1
Academicians	4	1	1
Medical Doctors	2	1	1
Writers/Journalists	3	1	2
Labour	1	0	0
Other	1	4	4

[Sources: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900, The Dictionary of National Biography, Boase's Modern English Biography, Boylan's Dictionary of Irish Biography, the British Biographical Archive: Seventeenth through the Nineteenth Centuries, and the Dictionary of Business Biography.]

This information can be converted into percentages of each profession

/income category as in Table 45:

Table 45

Percentage of those members of different Professions in the Parliament of 1895-1900 who received Honors

	Knighthood	Baronetage	Peerage
Businessmen	19.2	19.9	11.1
Government	22.0	18.0	50.0
Military	26.9	16.4	22.4
Landholding	5.3	22.7	24.0
Barrister	22.1	13.4	15.7
Solicitor	0	0	4.5
Academicians	36.4	9.1	9.1
Medical Doctors	15.4	7.7	7.7
Writers/Journalists	17.6	5.9	11.8
Labour	5.6	0	0
Other	3.0	12.1	12.1

[Sources: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900, The Dictionary of National Biography, Boase's Modern English Biography, Boylan's Dictionary of Irish Biography, the British Biographical Archive: Seventeenth through the Nineteenth Centuries, and the Dictionary of Business Biography.]

If one combines the percentage for baronets and peers, that is, inheritable titles, over 68% of those in government received such honors. This does make some sense since this government, Salisbury's third, was known for its aristocratic flavor, and titles are a reward for time spent in service to the nation. Landholders are next at 46.7%, military follows at nearly 39%, businessmen at 31%, and barristers at over 29%. In knighthoods, interestingly, academicians lead at over 36%, then comes the

military at nearly 27%, barristers at over 22%, government at 22%, and businessmen at 19%.

The businessmen who sat in this parliament received honors, albeit in a different mixture (more baronetages, fewer peerages), nearly as often as those in two of the long-standing classifications of landholding, and barrister. Adding the percentages of all of the different honors, knighthoods, baronetages, and peerages, government leads with 90%, followed by military at 66.7%, landholding at 52%, barristers at 51.2%, and business at 49.2%. Because of the high percentage of knights, academicians actually beat landholders at 54.6%.

If the honors system can be said to represent acknowledgement by the nation for services rendered - recognition by the government through its recommendations for honors, and confirmation by the monarch, the font of honors - then clearly those businessmen who sat in this Parliament had arrived and had been accepted by what could be called the establishment of the era.

Political Affiliation

Table 46 gives a breakdown of businessmen divided into professions correlated to their political affiliation. While those in finance: bankers, insurance, and other financial services, seem to be conservatives or liberal unionists (37 conservative, 16 liberal unionists compared to 14 Liberals, 2 radicals and one other), this rightward weighing of political affiliation is often the result of the political affiliation of those who are asked to serve on the company boards.

Table 46
Political Affiliation by Business Sector

	C	LU	L	R	APIN	Other
Banker:						
• Chairman/President/Partner	14	7	5			1
• Director	5		2	1		
• Founder	2	1				
Total	21	8	7	1		1
Insurance Company:						
• Chairman/President/Partner	1	1	1			
• Officers	1	1				
• Director	8	1	4	1		
Total	10	3	5	1		
Other Financial:						
• Stockbroker	4	3				
• Accountant	1	1	1			
• Other	4	1	2			
Total	9	5	3			
Shipping:						
• Owner/Head/Chairman/GM	6	4	6	1	1	
• Director	5					
Total	11	4	6	1	1	
Railway						
• Chairman/President/GM	3	2	4			
• Director	15	2	5	1		
Total	18	4	9	1		
Cotton:						
• Spinner	6		4			
• Weaver	2		3			
• Printer			3			

Table 46 continued

	C	LU	L	R	APIN	Other
• Machinery	1					
• Broker			1			
Total	9		11			
Wool/Linen	2		8			
Steel	8	5	4	3		
Construction	4	1	3			
Shipbuilding/Marine Engineer	5	3	2	2		
Telecommunications	3	1				
Utility	2		5			
Brewer	11	1	5			
Distillery	3				2	
Colliery	6	4	14			
News Publication	5		5	1	8	2
Foreign Merchants	4	3	3	1	1	
Real Estate	6		4			
Mining	1		1			
Retail	2					
Merchant	7	3	8	1	8	
Non-Food Manufacturer	13	3	10			
Wine/Tea Merchant			4	1	2	
Other Food	2		5	1	4	1
Printer/Publication	5	1	2		1	
Hotels	1				1	
Canal/Docks	1	2	2			1
Warehouse	3					

[Sources: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900, The Dictionary of National Biography, Boase's Modern English Biography, Boylan's Dictionary of Irish Biography, the British Biographical Archive: Seventeenth through the Nineteenth Centuries, and the Dictionary of Business Biography.]

For instance, there are three Chairman/ President/ Partner listed under insurance, one each conservative, liberal unionists, and liberal, but the political orientation of those MPs who were officers were one conservative and one Liberal Unionist and the directors were eight conservative, one liberal unionist, four liberals, and one radical, thus pushing the political orientation rightward. This holds true for banking, insurance, shipping, and railways. Brewers, marine engineering, foreign trade, publishers, and warehousemen also tended to be conservative, while construction, steel, cotton related, news publication, real estate, non-food manufacturing and canals/docks MPs tended to be a bit more balanced, and those in the wool/linen, collieries, utilities, merchant, wine and tea, and other food tended to be to the left politically.

Religion

The religious affiliation of members of parliament is not information that is readily available. Except in cases where an MP was noted for his religious stands, Dod's Parliamentary Companion does not list it. In some cases reference to it can be found in articles in the British Bibliographical Archive or one of the Dictionary of National Biography editions, and occasionally (the Rothschilds, for example) it is obvious. Thus, at this time, I have been able to determine the religious affiliation of 168 of the 765 (21.96%) members of this Parliament (Table 47).

Table 47
Known Religious Affiliation of MPs
Parliament of 1895-1900

Raw Number:											
COE	METH	CONG	BAP	Q	J	COS	RC	COI	PRES	U	Other
65	18	9	4	10	4	4	26	2	9	6	11
In Percentage Terms:											
38.7	10.7	5.4	2.4	6.0	2.4	2.4	15.5	1.2	5.4	3.6	6.5

COE = Church of England METH = Methodist CONG = Congregationalist
 BAP = Baptist Q = Quaker J = Jewish COS = Church of Scotland
 RC = Roman Catholic COI = Church of Ireland PRES = Presbyterian U = Unitarian

[Sources: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900, The Dictionary of National Biography, Boase's Modern English Biography, Boylan's Dictionary of Irish Biography, the British Biographical Archive: Seventeenth through the Nineteenth Centuries, and the Dictionary of Business Biography.]

Table 48 correlates the political affiliation with the religious affiliation:

Table 48
Correlation of Religious Affiliation to Political Affiliation

	COE	METH	CONG	BAP	Q	J	COS	RC	COI	PRES	U	Other
C	48	1	1			1	3	1	2	3	2	2
L-U	7	1			1	2	1	1			2	1
L	10	15	6	3	8	1		5		4	1	6
R		1	1									1
APIN			1		1			13		1	1	
PHR								6				1
Other				1								

[Sources: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900, The Dictionary of National Biography, Boase's Modern English Biography, Boylan's Dictionary of Irish Biography, the British Biographical Archive: Seventeenth through the Nineteenth Centuries, and the Dictionary of Business Biography.]

This sample shows nearly 74% of the known Church of England members belonging to the Conservative party, and 75% of Conservative Party members being in the Church of England, suggesting the old quip about the Church being the Tory

party at prayer may be accurate. Almost a third of the other Conservatives belonged to old 'establishment' churches, the Church of Scotland and the Church of Ireland.

While the second largest number of Church of England members in our sample belonged to the Liberal party, as a percentage of party membership, the Church of England communicant presence in the Liberal Unionists was larger at nearly 44%. This compatibility may well have helped to facilitate the eventual merger of the Conservative and Liberal Unionist parties in 1912.

The Liberal party, with members in almost every category, especially the old dissenting churches, can be said clearly to have been the non-establishment party. Roman Catholics were largely in the parties supporting Irish nationalism or home rule: half being Anti-Parnellite Irish Nationalists, nearly a quarter Parnellite Home Rulers, and nearly 20% belonging to the Liberal party, which for ten years had supported Irish Home Rule. The other category consists of four non-denominational "non-conformists," three non-denominational "Protestants," a member of United Free Church, an Apostolic Catholic Church member and two agnostics.

Table 49 shows an analysis of the correlation between religious affiliation and profession. Members of the Church of England are widely dispersed in fourteen of twenty-six categories, concentrating, however, in the professions of barrister, government official, and military. While the profession of barrister also has a large number of members in other religions, those in government and military were overwhelmingly members of the Church of England.

Table 49
Religion Correlated to Professions/Income Category

	COE	METH	CONG	BAP	Q	J	COS	RC	COI	PRES	U	Other
Govern.	8							1			1	
Law	3							2			1	2
Military	7						1					
Barrister	19	4	1	1			1	4	2	3		3
Solicitor		2		1				1				
MD								6				
Education	2	1		1				1				1
Writer/ Journalist								5				1
Labour		4		1								
Other/ Unknown	2		2									
Bank	4		1		2	3						
Other/ Financial	3					1	2					
Shipping	1	1										
Railway								1				
Cotton	5									1		
Wool			1									
Iron/Steel	3	11			1						2	
Cons/ Ship build/mar eng	1				1							
Telecom.												
Brewer								1				
Distillery										1		
Colliery		1			2							1
News	1							1				1
Other	5	5	5		3			2		3		1

[Sources: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900, The Dictionary of National Biography, Boase's Modern English Biography, Boylan's Dictionary of Irish Biography, the British Biographical Archive: Seventeenth through the Nineteenth Centuries, and the Dictionary of Business Biography.]

Among the business categories, four of ten bankers were Church of England members, three Jewish, two Quakers and one Congregationalist. Half of “other financial” were Church of England, the other affiliations being Church of Scotland and Jewish. Five of six in the cotton trade were members of the Church of England.

All six of the medical doctors were Roman Catholics as were five of the six in the category of writer/journalist and four of thirty-eight of the barristers. Probably the reason was the pool of highly educated and highly articulate Irishmen who could be sent to Westminster by those opposed to English rule was largely concentrated in these professions. Irish landholding was concentrated in the hands of “alien” English landholders and business in Ireland, outside of Dublin and Belfast, was mainly in the areas of food production, processing, and distribution.

Committees

To analyze the membership of the 132 Parliamentary committees in the Parliament of 1895 to 1900 our fourteen classifications used elsewhere in this study were utilized. Committees dealing with similar subjects were consolidated and it was found that the classification of Foreign Affairs had no committees. As shown on Table 50, the participation of businessmen on Parliamentary committees in the Parliament of 1895 to 1900 ranged from a high of 54% of members on committees dealing with Local Issues to a low of over 11% on Judicial Issues.

Table 50
Types of Committees in the Parliament of 1895-1900
and Business Participation on those Committees

	Percentage of Businessmen On Committees	Number of Committees
Local	54%	12
Economy/Business/Trade	46%	35
Government Finance	45%	7
Scots	39%	7
Military & Naval	39%	2
Social	37%	20
Religion	35%	2
Irish	34%	10
Government Administration	29%	11
Parliamentary	23%	10
Education and Culture	20%	6
Empire	17%	2
Judicial	11%	8
Foreign Affairs	0%	0
Total		132

[Source: British Sessional Papers, Parliament of 1895-1900.]

In Table 51, six committee classifications – Local; Business, Economics and Trade; Government Finance; Scottish Issues; Military; and Social Issues had businessmen participating at or above their percentage of the whole of the House of Commons membership. The committees dealing with Local Issues were disproportionately composed of businessmen. While businessmen constituted 37% of

the MPs in this Parliament, they totaled 54% of the committeemen dealing in local issues. This is 146% of their proportional representation. Businessmen elected to Parliament often were leading citizens of the areas they represented. Indeed, forty-one of the 287 businessman MPs (over 14.3% of business MPs) had been mayors of towns, and many other business MPs had been aldermen. This indicates that the leadership in Parliament must have thought of business MPs as being those who would be most knowledgeable concerning any issues of a local nature.

Table 51
Participation on Committees by Different Professions/Income Classifications

	Bus.	Barr.	Sol.	Govt.	Land	Mil.	MD	Edu.	Labor	Other/ Unk.	Auth/ Journal	Total #
Local	73 54%	31 23%	1 1%	7 5%	4 3%	2 1%	4 3%	2 1%	4 3%	7 5%		135
Bus./ Econ.	337 46%	125 17%	30 4%	61 8%	58 8%	52 7%	14 2%	8 1%	28 4%	17 2%	3 1%	733
Govt. Fin.	50 45%	15 14%	2 2%	10 9%	6 5%	13 12%	3 3%		4 4%	3 3%	4 4%	110
Scots	35 39%	30 13%	3 3%	3 3%	6 7%	3 3%	4 4%	1 1%		3 3%	1 1%	89
Mil.	12 39%	4 13%		2 6%	1 3%	9 30%	1 3%	2 6%				31
Soc.	117 37%	61 19%	9 3%	28 9%	24 8%	21 7%	18 6%	13 4%	10 3%	11 3%	4 1%	315
Rel.	7 35%	5 25%		1 5%	1 5%	1 5%	1 5%		2 10%	1 5%	1 5%	20
Irish	33 34%	32 33%	3 3%	8 8%	11 11%	4 4%	1 1%		2 2%	1 1%	2 2%	97
Govt. Adm.	24 29%	41 33%	2 2%	20 24%	11 13%	5 6%		3 4%	2 2%	1 1%		83
Par.	29 23%	41 33%	5 4%	10 8%	8 6%	18 14%		2 2%	6 5%	5 4%	2 2%	126
Edu./ Cult.	18 20%	23 25%		12 13%	11 12%	3 3%	4 4%	10 11%	6 7%	3 3%	2 2%	92
Emp.	5 17%	10 33%		11 37%	1 7%	1 7%						30
Jud.	49 11%	196 54%	42 11%	29 8%	20 5%	17 5%	4 1%	2 1%	4 1%	10 3%		366
For. Aff.	782 35%	588 26%	97 4%	202 9%	162 7%	149 7%	54 2%	40 2%	69 3%	63 3%	20 1%	2226

[Source: British Sessional Papers, Parliament of 1895-1900.]

Three of the classifications – Government Finance; Law and the Judiciary; and Business, Economics, and Trade – had standing committees as well as the occasional select committees. Under Government Finance, the standing committee on Public Accounts averaged approximately 50% businessmen and other committees in this classification had from 24% to 59% businessmen as members.

The standing committees on the Law and the Judiciary and on Business, Economics and Trade also had select subcommittees that had specially appointed members who dealt with certain issues. I have allocated these select subcommittees to the classification that most closely correlated to the subject for which they had been chosen. As an example, in 1896 a select subcommittee of the Standing Committee on the Law and Judiciary, appointed on 13 March, dealt with benefices. Since benefices concern Church revenue, this subcommittee was assigned to Religion. Other examples of the reallocation of the Law and Judiciary Standing Committee select subcommittees include: a 26 July 1896 select subcommittee on the Irish Labour Bill assigned to Irish Issues; a 3 July 1896 select committee on Locomotives assigned to Business, Economics and Trade; a 21 June 1898 select committee that dealt with the delightfully named Vexatious Actions – Scotland Bill assigned to Scottish Issues; and so forth. In all, thirty Law and Judiciary select subcommittees were so assigned: ten to Social Issues; five to Scottish Issues; five to Business Economics and Trade; three to Education and Culture; two to Local Issues; two to Irish Issues; and one each to Religion, Law, and Military. Similarly, the Standing Committee on Business and Economics had eight select subcommittees, six

concerning trade, one on Education and Culture, and one on Ireland.

There were twelve select committees dealing with Local Issues: five on Police and Sanitary Regulations Bills (an interesting juxtaposition) with business MPs comprising 50% to 67% of the memberships; two on London water (29% and 56% businessmen); two on Metropolitan Gas Companies (53% on both); and one each on local franchise, provisional orders and borough funds (47%, 60%, and 60%).

Business, Economics and Trade had 35 committees which dealt with a broad variety of issues: fishing, harbors, shipping, food and agricultural issues, telephony, merchandise marks, railways and locomotives, petroleum, boilers, coal mining, money lending, and corporate governance bills. Participation by businessmen ranged from a low of 7% on the committee dedicated to agricultural holdings, to between 13% and 33% on four committees dealing with railways and locomotives; 13% to 33% on three committees concerning land; 20% to 31% on fishing; 33% on money lending; 40% on coal mines; 50% to 73% on petroleum issues; and 93% on boilers regulation (fourteen of fifteen members, the other being a labour MP).

There were seven committees on government finance. Four Public Accountants committees where business participation ranged from 33% to 60%, a Committee concerning the Royal Patriotic Fund which had 24% business MPs, and 40% and 59% businessmen on two committees dealing with government contracts.

There were also seven committees on Scottish Issues. They included religious, social, and economic issues, Parliamentary procedure for Scots' private Bills, and a committee on public libraries. Business participation ranged from a low of 20% on

the Public Libraries – Scotland committee, to 33% on both a Harbors committee and an Ecclesiastical Associations committee, to 40% on a committee dealing with Housing in Edinburgh, to 47% on committees dealing with Parliamentary procedure, Vectious Actions, and Executors.

Social Issues include health, poor law, burial grounds, lifeboat institution, and fire brigades. Subjects of committees dealing with health issues included veterinarian surgeons, vaccination, hospitals, Public Health Acts, midwives, and infants. Business participation on these committees ranged from 20% for veterinarians, 27% on the committee dealing with the vaccination bill, 29% on committees dealing with hospitals, 40% on those committees dealing with Public Health Acts and midwives, to 47% on the committee on infants. Four committees on the poor had business participation varying from 24% to 50%. Three burial grounds committees had business participation from 33% to 47%. The Lifeboat Institution committee had 47% business membership. The small houses committee and the cottage houses committee each had 33% businessmen as members, and the committee on habitual inebriates had 40% business membership.

Only two committees dealt with religious issues – and at that, they were really financial issues. In 1900 a Joint Select Committee of the Houses of Lords and Commons dealt with Queen Anne's Bounty and in 1896 a law subcommittee dealt with benefices. Of the five members from the House of Commons on the joint committee, one was a businessman, whereas of the fifteen members on the subcommittee on benefices, six were businessmen.

Irish issues occupied ten committees, seven of which involved Irish business issues: two on general business issues, three on railways, one on navigation and one on labour. On the committees dealing with two general business bills, 31% and 60% were businessmen, on the three railway bills, 29%, 50% and 60%, on the navigation issue, 80% and on the labour bill, 7% (with barristers at 27% and landholders at 33% on this committee). Two committees dealt with local issues: a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons with one of the four MPs a businessman, and 56% businessmen on the committee dealing with Belfast and Londonderry. Only one of fifteen members on the committee concerning Irish solicitors was a businessman.

Ten committees are classified under Government Administration. One dealt with stationary contracts where seven of fourteen were businessmen. One of seven appointed to the committee that managed Gladstone's funeral was a businessman. The remaining eight committees dealt with office sites and businessmen composed 7%, 8%, 20%, 20%, 40%, 40%, 60% and 60% of the committees which varied in total from 5 to fourteen members.

There were only ten committees dealing with Parliamentary Issues. Instead of the 56 committees in the Parliament of 1852-1857 each of which dealt with election petitions involving individual constituency elections, two committees in this later Parliament dealt with all petitions. Businessmen constituted 22% of each of these committees. Three committees were concerned with internal issues including one on personal interests of MPs. Businessmen made up 8%, 17%, and 33% of these committees. One committee was a joint committee with the House of Lords on

permanent staff. Two of the five House of Commons members were businessmen. Finally, four committees dealt with House of Commons Kitchen and Refreshment rooms. Businessmen varied from 20% to 29% (but always included James Bailey, a hotelier) of these committees. Interestingly, the highest percentage of membership on these committees went to those who had been in the military.

Bills

There were 1622 Bills enumerated by the House of Commons during the Parliament of 1895 to 1900. 1327 (81.8%) of them originated in the House of Commons and were printed, 199 (12.3%) came from the House of Lords and were printed, and 96 (5.9%) were numbered but not printed. These printed Bills have been organized into our fourteen categories. The category with the largest number of Bills was Business and Economics, followed by Local, Scots Issues, Social, Irish Issues, and so forth to Foreign Affairs which had eight (Table 52). Business Bills made up twenty-two percent of the House of Commons originated Bills and over 21% of all Bills. The number of Local Bills (at 253) was close behind at over 19% of Bills (Table 53). However, if one was to look at this as representing requests for parliamentary approval for changes to local governmental structures (such as enclosures had previously represented) or authorizations for undertakings (such as the requests for utility authority in the previously looked at parliament) this number may be a bit misleading. One hundred forty-two of these 253 Local Bills were submitted

to the House of Commons by the government in order to gain parliamentary approval for actions already taken by local authorities.

Chart 52
Parliamentary Bills 1896 to 1900

	Number of Printed House Of Commons Bills	Number of Enumerated House of Lord's Bills	Number of Enumerated Unprinted Bills	Total
Business/Economy	292	26	24	342
Local	253	59	6	318
Scots	173	14	3	190
Social	160	16	12	188
Irish	149	9	27	185
Judiciary	80	25	11	116
Education/Culture	39	23	3	65
Parliament	39	3	5	47
Gov't Finance	35	0	1	36
Religion	33	10	3	46
Military	27	5	1	33
Gov't Admin.	21	3	0	24
Empire	18	4	0	22
Foreign Affairs	8	2	0	10
Totals	1327	199	96	1622

[Source: British Sessional Papers, Parliament of 1895-1900.]

The above can be expressed in percentage terms to show how many of the bills originating in each house were in different categories, and what percentage that category contributed of all of the bills submitted in this Parliament.

The vast majority of Bills originated in the House of Commons. If one ranks categories by the percentage of bills within the categories originating in the House of Commons (Table 54), government finance ranks first with 97.3% of printed introduced Bills originating in the Commons. This is to be expected, of course, since

Table 53
Parliamentary Bills 1896 to 1900, by Percentage

	Percentage of Printed House of Commons' Bills	Percentage of Enumerated House of Lords' Bills	Percentage of Enumerated Unprinted Bills	Total
Business/Economy	22.0%	13.1%	25.0%	21.1%
Local	19.1%	29.6%	6.25%	19.6%
Scots	13.1%	7.0%	3.1%	11.7%
Social	12.1%	7.5%	12.5%	11.5%
Irish	11.3%	4.5%	28.1%	11.4%
Judiciary	6.0%	12.6%	11.5%	7.15%
Education./Culture	2.9%	11.6%	3.1%	5.0%
Parliament	2.9%	1.5%	5.2%	2.9%
Government Finance	2.6%	0.5%	1.0%	2.3%
Religion	2.5%	5.0%	3.1%	2.8%
Military	2.0%	2.5%	1.0%	2.0%
Government Administration	1.6%	1.5%	0%	1.5%
Empire	1.4%	2.0%	0%	1.4%
Foreign Affairs	0.6%	1.0%	0%	0.6%

[Source: British Sessional Papers, Parliament of 1895-1900.]

the English Constitution requires that all revenue bills originate in the Commons.

Next are Scots Bills at 91.1%, followed by Government Administration at 87.5%,

Social at 85.6%, and Business and Economics at 85.4%. The percentage of Parliament, Military, Empire, Irish, Foreign Affairs, and Local bills originating in the House of Commons are all in the low 80s or high 70s. Religion at 71.7%, Judicial at 69%, and Education and Culture at 60% are those categories where a relatively large percentage of Bills originated in the Lords.

Table 54
By Classification, Percentage of Bills Originating in the House of Commons, Parliament of 1895-1900

Government Finance	97.3%
Scots	91.1%
Government Administration	87.5%
Social	85.6%
Business and Economy	85.4%
Parliamentary	83.0%
Military	81.5%
Empire	81.3%
Irish	80.5%
Foreign Affairs	80.0%
Local	79.6%
Religion	71.1%
Judicial	69.0%
Education and Culture	60.0%

[Source: British Sessional Papers, Parliament of 1895-1900.]

For our purposes, another way of analyzing the Bills introduced in the Parliament of 1895 to 1900 is by the percentage having at least one businessman as a sponsor of the House of Commons originated Bills. Bills concerning Parliament

itself led the list with 79.5% of the Bills having at least one business related sponsor. Business and Economics was next with 69.5%, Scots followed at 67.6%, then Social at 65%, Judicial at 57.5%, Education and Culture at 56.4% and Foreign Affairs at 50%. The category with the lowest percentage was Government Finance at 20%.

Table 55 below shows this information:

Table 55
Percent of Printed House of Commons Bills with at Least One Business Sponsor

Parliament	79.5%
Business	69.5%
Scots	67.6%
Social	65.0%
Judiciary	57.5%
Education and Culture	56.4%
Foreign Affairs	50.0%
Religion	42.4%
Military	40.7%
Empire	38.9%
Irish	36.9%
Government Administration	23.8%
Local	23.3%
Government Finance	20.0%

[Source: British Sessional Papers, Parliament of 1895-1900.]

If one ranks the categories with the number of sponsors, Business and Economics leads the list with 1607, followed by Social at 866, Scots at 854, Local at 691, Irish at 569, and on down to Foreign Affairs at 44. Table 56 below lists these categories and breaks out the sponsorship into the profession/income classifications.

Table 56
Types of Bills by Number of Sponsors in Profession/Income Categories

	Bus.	Barr.	Sol.	Govt.	Land	Mil.	MD	Edu.	Writer/ Journal	Other/ Unk.	Labor	Total Spon. Bills
Bus./ Econ.	544	289	64	214	67	111	35	28	27	76	152	1607
Soc.	332	160	21	102	35	64	41	19	12	34	46	866
Scots	303	180	1	168	47	53	65	4	16	13	4	854
Local	114	84	12	394	5	42	-	9	4	18	9	691
Irish	116	112	29	175	41, 9	15	19	1	27	18	7	569
Judic.	92	153	33	54	13	18	4	1	9	8	27	412
Par.	66	56	12	21	7	23	13	6	8	8	12	232
Edu./ Cult.	61	45	6	41	8	8	8	8	2	5	7	199
Rel.	31	74	6	26	17	16	2	4	3	7	3	189
Govt. Fin.	13	11	2	76	-	3	2	1	-	1	-	109
Emp.	17	7	9	28	2	5	-	-	6	1	-	75
Mil.	12	7	-	40	2	13	-	-	-	1	-	75
Govt. Adm.	11	8	4	38	5	1	-	-	-	4	-	71
For. Aff.	12	9	-	15	-	6	-	-	-	-	2	44

Note: Under the heading Land in the Irish row, two numbers are given. The top one is number of sponsors who were landholders, the bottom is the number of non-landholders (tenants), who introduced bills. Since their interests often diverged I decided to separate the two sponsorships. This also will hold true for Tables 57, 60, and 61.

[Source: British Sessional Papers, Parliament of 1895-1900.]

The previous table can be analyzed to arrive at the percentage of businessmen sponsors of all the sponsors of Bills in each of the fourteen categories (Table 57) and these percentages can be charted in descending order

(Table 58.) What is found is that over 38% of the sponsors of Bills having to do with social issues were businessmen, 35.5% of the sponsors of Scots issues, almost 34% of the sponsors of business issues, 30.7% of the sponsors of education and cultural issues on down to just short of 12% of Bills involving government finance.

Table 57
Types of Bills by Percentage of Sponsor in Profession/Income Categories

	Bus.	Barr.	Sol.	Govt.	Land	Mil.	MD	Edu.	Writer/ Journal	Other/ Unk.	Labor	Total Spon. Bills
Bus./ Econ.	33.9	18.0	4.0	13.3	4.2	6.9	2.2	1.7	1.7	4.7	9.5	1607
Soc.	38.3	18.5	2.4	11.8	4.0	7.4	4.7	2.2	1.4	3.9	5.3	866
Scots	35.5	21.1	.1	19.7	5.5	6.2	7.6	.5	1.9	1.5	.5	854
Local	16.5	12.2	1.7	57.0	.7	6.1	-	1.3	.6	2.6	1.3	691
Irish	20.4	19.7	5.1	30.8	7.2, 1.69	2.6	3.3	.2	4.7	3.2	1.2	569
Judic.	22.3	37.1	8.0	13.1	3.2	4.4	1.0	.2	2.2	1.9	6.6	412
Par.	28.4	24.1	5.2	9.1	3.0	9.9	5.6	2.6	3.4	3.4	5.2	232
Edu./ Cult.	30.7	22.6	3.0	20.6	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	1.0	2.5	3.5	199
Rel.	16.4	39.2	3.2	13.8	9.0	8.5	1.1	2.1	1.6	3.7	1.6	189
Govt. Fin.	11.9	10.1	1.8	69.7	-	2.8	1.8	.9	-	.9	-	109
Emp.	22.7	9.3	12.0	37.3	2.7	6.7	-	-	8.0	1.3	-	75
Mil.	16.0	9.3	-	53.3	2.7	17.3	-	-	-	1.3	-	75
Govt. Adm.	15.5	11.3	5.6	53.3	7	1.4	-	-	-	5.6	-	71
For. Aff.	27.3	20.5	-	34.1	-	13.6	-	-	-	-	4.5	44

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900 and British Sessional Papers, Parliament of 1895-1900.]

Table 58
Bill Sponsorship Ranked by Percentage of Business Sponsorship

Social	38.3%
Scots	35.5%
Business	33.9%
Education and Culture	30.7%
Parliamentary	28.4%
Foreign Affairs	27.3%
Empire	22.7%
Judicial	22.3%
Irish	20.4%
Local	16.5%
Religion	16.4%
Military	16.0%
Government Administration	15.5%
Government Finance	11.9%

[Source: British Sessional Papers, Parliament of 1895-1900.]

With 287 businessmen out of 765 in this Parliament, representing 37.5% of the members of this Parliament, the percentages on this chart seem to indicate that businessmen are not participating to the extent of their percentage in the Parliament. However, as noted above, in one category, Local, there were numerous provisional orders Bills. Evidently, local bodies were given the right to make decisions about local issues, however, those decisions had to be ratified, and were so ratified by these Bills. The sponsors of these bills were government ministers. Indeed, many bills often had government ministers as a sponsor.

One can go behind these numbers by reallocating government ministers to their earlier occupations. Sometimes the earlier occupation is government, diplomacy for example, but often it is business, the law, or landholdings. Table 59 reallocates those who were government sponsors to their original occupations. The table is organized from the largest to the smallest number of government sponsors. Thus Local is first. Table 60 shows the reallocated employment categories merged with those already in those occupations from Table 56. Table 61 expresses this as a percentage, and Table 62 lists these percentages in descending order.

Table 59
Reallocation of Government Members by Previous Occupation

	Bus.	Barr.	Sol.	Govt.	Land	Mil.	MD	Edu.	Writer/ Journal	Other/ Unk.	Labor	Gov. Occ.
Local	128	8	-	116	134	5	-	-	3	-	-	394
Bus.	60	44	-	56	37	9	1	-	6	1	-	214
Irish	1	95	-	22	5	-	-	-	52	-	-	175
Scots	252	51	-	32	9	11	-	40	-	-	-	168
Soc.	18	19	-	29	26	1	-	4	1	4	-	102
Govt. Fin.	23	17	-	29	6	1	-	-	-	-	-	76
Jud.	27	-	2	11	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	54
Edu./ Cult.	3	112	-	11	15	3	-	-	7	-	-	41
Mil.	6	7	-	15	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	40
Govt. Adm.	14	8	-	7	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	38
Emp.	8	5	-	9	4	2	-	-	-	-	-	28
Rel	-	8	2	11	2	-	-	-	4	-	-	26
Par.	3	9	-	5	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	21
For. Aff.	7	1	-	5	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	15

[Source: British Sessional Papers, Parliament of 1895-1900.]

Table 60
Reallocation of Government Members Merged
with Bill Sponsors from Table 56

	Bus.	Barr.	Sol.	Govt.	Land	Mil.	MD	Edu.	Writer/ Journal	Other/ Unk.	Labor	
Bus./ Econ.	604	333	64	56	104	120	36	28	33	77	152	1607
Soc.	350	179	21	29	61	65	41	23	13	38	46	866
Scots	328	231	1	32	56	64	65	44	16	13	4	854
Local	242	94	12	116	139	47	-	9	7	18	9	691
Irish	117	207	29	22	46, 9	15	19	1	79	18	7	569
Judic.	119	153	35	11	27	18	4	1	9	8	27	412
Par.	69	65	12	5	11	23	13	6	8	8	12	232
Edu./ Cult.	64	57	6	11	13	11	8	8	9	5	7	199
Rel.	31	82	8	11	19	16	2	4	6	7	3	189
Govt. Fin.	36	28	2	29	-	4	2	1	-	1	-	109
Emp.	25	12	9	9	6	7	-	-	6	1	-	75
Mil.	18	14	-	15	14	13	-	-	-	1	-	75
Govt. Adm.	25	16	4	7	14	1	-	-	-	5.6	-	71
For. Aff.	19	10	-	5	2	6	-	-	-	-	2	44

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900 and British Sessional Papers, Parliament of 1895-1900.]

Chart 61

Reallocation of Government Merged with Bill Sponsors from Table 56 expressed as Percentages

	Bus.	Barr	Sol.	Govt.	Land	Mil.	MD	Edu.	Writer/ Journal	Other/ Unk.	Labor	Total
Bus.	37.6	20.7	4.0	3.6	6.5	7.5	2.2	1.7	2.0	4.8	9.4	1607
Soc.	40.4	20.7	2.4	3.3	7.0	7.5	4.7	2.7	1.5	4.4	5.3	866
Scots	38.4	27.0	0.1	3.7	6.6	7.5	7.6	5.2	1.9	1.5	0.5	854
Local	35.0	13.6	1.7	16.8	20.1	6.8		1.3	1.0	2.6	1.3	691
Irish	20.6	36.4	5.0	3.9	8.1, 1.6	2.6	3.3	0.2	13.9	3.2	1.2	569
Judic.	28.9	37.1	8.5	2.7	6.6	4.4	1.0	.2	2.2	1.9	6.6	412
Par.	29.7	28.0	5.2	2.2	4.7	10.0	5.6	2.6	3.4	3.4	5.2	232
Edu./ Cult.	32.2	28.6	3.0	5.5	6.5	5.5	4.0	4.0	4.5	2.5	3.5	199
Rel.	16.4	43.4	4.2	5.8	10.0	8.5	1.1	2.2	3.2	3.7	1.6	189
Govt. Fin.	33.0	25.7	1.8	26.6	5.5	3.7	1.8	.9		.9		109
Emp.	33.3	16.0	12.0	12.0	8.0	9.3			8.0	1.3		75
Mil.	24.0	18.7		20.0	18.7	17.3				1.3		75
Govt. Adm.	35.2	22.5	5.6	9.9	19.7	1.4				5.6		71
For. Aff.	43.2	22.7		11.4	4.5	13.6					4.5	44

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900 and British Sessional Papers, Parliament of 1895-1900.]

Chart 62

House of Commons Bills Ranked by Percentage of Business Sponsorship after Reallocation of Government Members to their previous Profession

Foreign Affairs	43.2%
Social	40.4%
Scots	38.4%
Business	37.6%
Government Administration	35.2%
Local	35.0%
Empire	33.3%
Government Finance	33.0%
Education and Culture	32.3%
Parliamentary	29.7%
Judicial	28.9%
Military	24.0%
Irish	20.6%
Religion	16.4%

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900 and British Sessional Papers, Parliament of 1895-1900.]

What conclusions can be drawn from all of this information? First, the vast majority of the Bills dealt with economic, local, social, and issues having to do with the two kingdoms (England, Scotland) in the United Kingdom. Second, the House of Commons was where the vast majority of these Bills, and most of the others as well, originated. Third, businessmen were very involved with business issues, as one might expect, but also with social and Scots issues. Fourth, businessmen were active sponsors of Bills (more than 20%) in most categories, but did not exceed their

percentage membership in this Parliament except in a one category, Social, and are close to their percentage in Business and Scots issues.

If one reallocates the government members who sponsor Bills to their original occupation (the percentage of businessmen in Parliament rises to about 39%) business sponsorship of Bills related to Foreign Affairs, Social, Scots, and Business are all in the range of the percentage of businessmen in this Parliament.

Legislation, Speeches, and Divisions

One of the best features in the study of the Parliament of 1852-1857 was the sample of the divisions that showed that businessmen regularly attended parliamentary sessions to a greater degree than did their fellow MPs from other income groups. Unfortunately, the details of the divisions of this Parliament are not available in the Sessional Papers. While Millbank systems has the divisions for this Parliament on-line, their listing of the divisions is for the whole period of 1800 to 2004 and is not divided by years, but rather is alphabetized. The divisions that are referenced in this study are among the few included in the Hansard text by Millbank.

Things aren't always what they seem. Sometimes certain issues were raised and debated in the House of Commons in the guise of other issues. One such is foreign trade. In the Parliament of 1895-1900 issues of foreign trade, specifically imports, were argued in the context of merchandise marks, agricultural imports and their markings, adulteration of food products, and, in what turned out to be the stalking horse in the anti-free trade movement in this particular Parliament,

importation of foreign prison made goods. Free trade had dominated economic thought in England since its victory in the Corn Law dispute in the 1840s, and Joseph Chamberlain had not yet proposed his scheme of Imperial Preference (that became public in 1902), but there was, nevertheless, an undercurrent of unease in the United Kingdom about Great Britain's relative economic position. The United States and Germany had risen in the preceding half-century to challenge England's previously unchallengeable industrial might. Further, as noted elsewhere, England's agriculture had suffered over the previous twenty years.

In 1862 Parliament passed a Bill, The Merchandise Marks Bill, which made illegal any forging, counterfeiting, or mislabeling any trademark and application of such to any article of trade with the intent to defraud. Enforcement, however, was difficult due to lack of ability to issue search warrants, detain falsely marked goods, the necessity of seeking indictments for enforcement of the law, and the necessity for the aggrieved party to prove intent on the part of the offending party. That offending party could either be domestic or foreign. If it was foreign, outside the reach of the laws of the United Kingdom, there was little that could be done. The goods couldn't be confiscated, and the offenders were beyond the reach of the British courts. In the Customs Consolidation Act of 1876 (and as modified by the Revenue Act of 1883), it was made illegal to import any article with a name and brand that indicated that it originated in the United Kingdom. However, those with just a brand or name were not included (that is manufactured abroad for a British distributor.) Also, there was

no method of enforcement against products mislabeled to indicate British origin if manufactured overseas and sent to a third nation.

The finished steel trades were suffering serious inroads from overseas. In particular, Sheffield steel, cutlery, and Sheffield silverplate (a process in which a base sheet of copper is overlaid with a sheet of silver and then pressed and heated so that the two separate sheets fuse) were all ‘feeling the heat’ of competition from abroad, and mislabeling was a central concern.

The issue of misbranded imports was not just a problem for Britain, though, and in the 1880s there were a series of international conferences to deal with this issue. In 1883 in Paris, and in 1886 in Rome, agreements were reached to try to constrain this problem. Each nation was to harmonize its laws with these international agreements (the United States first entered into the cooperative international trade arena by participating in these conventions.) In 1887, a select committee of the House of Commons proposed a modification of the Act of 1862 to reflect the results of these international conferences, resulting in the Merchandise Marks Act of 1887. Under this Act, any product with a mark improperly implying the item was manufactured in Britain, or any false statement as to the item’s characteristics (number, weight, measure, manufacturing process, etc.) subjected the article to seizure.³³

Over the course of this Parliament, from August of 1895 through 1899, there were a series of questions raised and proposals made for the enforcement and strengthening of this law. The first question, by Charles Murray, (C., Coventry) was

directed to Mr. Ritchie, (C., Croyden), President of the Board of Trade, a retired jute merchant and manufacturer, and concerned foreign marks located in obscure reaches on watches. Ritchie said he would investigate. Subsequent questions included the number of prosecutions instituted under the Act since 1891 (Mr. William Johnston, C., Belfast South, barrister);³⁴ whether the Act was interfering with British trade to the benefit of Hamburg (Mr. Charles Wilson, L., Hull West, ship owner);³⁵ why a merchant has three weeks after receipt of goods to modify a customs statement to clearly and properly indicate the characteristics of products (Mr. H. E. Kearley, L., Devonport, owner of a chain of grocery stores);³⁶ and about German made tins decorated with maps of India and Ceylon, a Union Jack, and pictures of Indian natives, thus making the tins look English (Sir Howard Vincent, C., Sheffield - Central, government service.)³⁷ Questions also were asked concerning the importation of agricultural products, for instance, about the importation of milk (Admiral Field, C., Sussex South), and butter (Mr. Kearley).³⁸

Amendments were proposed to the Merchandise Marks Act four times in 1896, 1897, 1898, and 1899 with twenty-two different members sponsoring them, including the previously mentioned Charles Murray; Admiral Field; and Howard Vincent. These twenty - two individuals included seven businessmen, six barristers, four who had been or were in the military, two who had been in government service, one landholder, one solicitor, and one labor representative.³⁹

In 1897, a select committee of fifteen, of whom eight were current or retired businessmen, was appointed to investigate the issue. The business members

included: Charles W. Cayzer, (C., Barrow), a senior partner in a shipping firm; Joseph Howard, (C., Tottenham), retired barrister, now iron tube trader; John Eustace Jameson, (APIN, Clare West), retired military, now head of his family's distillery; Richard M'Ghee, (Anti-Parnellite Home Ruler, Louth South), commission agent; Anthony J. Mundella, (L., Sheffield – Brightside), retired hosiery manufacturer (he died near the end of July 1897); Albert Rollit, (C., Islington South), solicitor, ship owner; Charles H. Wilson, (L., Hull West), chairman of steamship company; and John Wilson, (Radical, Govan), iron tube manufacturer.⁴⁰

Legislation to address the agricultural issues was introduced. Led by Kearley, the fourteen sponsors included nine Liberals, three Conservatives, a Radical and an Anti-Parnellite Irish Nationalist. They were largely agriculturalists, lawyers, and consumer goods affiliated businessmen, though there were two in the iron and steel trades. The government responded by submitting its own legislation led by Henry Chaplin, (C., Lincolnshire–Sealford), a landed gentleman who was President of the Local Government Board; Walter Long, (C., Liverpool - West Derby), also landed, President of the Board of Agriculture; and Thomas W. Russell, (L. U., Tyrone South), Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Governing Board.⁴¹

Additionally, a committee on agricultural product's marks was formed, which had seven Conservatives, three Liberal Unionists, two Liberals, and one each APIN, APHR and Radical. Professionally, there were five businessmen, five landholders and two barristers on the committee. In particular Kearly, again, was on the committee as well as John Brigg (L., Keighley division of Yorkshire), worsted

manufacturer; John K. D. Wingfield-Digby (C., Dorset North), landholder; George Doughty (L. U., Great Grimsby), merchant and ship owner; James H. C. Hozier, (C., Lanarkshire South), private secretary of Salisbury (and married to Lady Mary Cecil, daughter of the Marquess of Exeter and a distant relative of Salisbury); and Denis Kilbride (APIN, Galloway North), a dispossessed Irish tenant.⁴²

Further, a related bill, to restrict the importation of prison made goods, was proposed, also supported by Admiral Field, Vincent, Boulnois, Rasch, Seeger Hunt, and MacLure among others. The sponsorship included six businessmen, two in government, one retired military, one barrister and one labor representative.⁴³

In 1897 the government brought forward a bill to deal with foreign prison made goods. Introduced on March 4, it was read for the second time on the 13th of May. Eighteen spoke, Charles Ritchie, President of the Board of Trade, opening for the government. One can estimate the amount of time spoken by the number of lines of text. On the second reading of this bill the Millbank system text of Hansard shows about 1161 lines of speech. Chamberlain, at 242.5 lines of speech (almost 21% of the lines devoted to this issue), was the leading proponent of the issue, followed by Sir Howard Vincent, 102.5 lines (8.8%) and Ritchie, 101 lines (8.7%). James Dalziel, 131 lines (11.3%), James Bryce 107 lines (9.2%), Thomas Palmer Whittaker 82 lines (7.1%), and John Burns 78 lines (6.7%) led the opposition.⁴⁴

Ritchie pointed out that in 1895 Sir Charles Vincent, member for Sheffield, had proposed a motion that the United Kingdom ban the importation of foreign made prison goods. Mr. Bryce, President of the Board of Trade in the Rosebery

government, suggested that a committee of the House be formed to investigate the issue. Although Sir Charles (he received his knighthood in 1896) rejected the idea, the government of the time allowed the motion to pass without a division. Bryce subsequently appointed a departmental committee, including several members of the Commons, to investigate. The committee reported that in certain product categories, specifically mats and brushes, prison-made goods were impacting British manufacturing. Ritchie explained that the Salisbury administration had tried to negotiate with Germany, Belgium, Holland, and France (and had discussions with the United States), but no arrangements could be made. Therefore, the government had brought forth this measure to ban prison made goods.

He pointed out that this type of legislation was not unusual, both Canada and the United States had laws banning the importation for sale of prison made goods. Some might complain that implementation of the legislation would be difficult. That might be, but the government's Consuls at foreign ports would be instructed to look for any evidence necessary for enforcement. Further, just the fact that this legislation had passed would help guarantee non-importation of such goods.

Opposing, James H. Dalziel, (L., Kirkcaldy), a journalist, ignoring the negotiations that the government had entered into, congratulated the government for finally getting around to this one of their election pledges. He went on to argue, however, that the facts didn't warrant this action. While it might be true some damage was being suffered by parts of the economy, the employment in the brush trade had increased by about 20% in the past decade and employment in mat making

was up. When the departmental committee sought public input, few came forward, indicating not much demand for the legislation.

He wasn't convinced that the mechanisms employed in the bill would succeed. Complaints to the Commissioners of Customs, triggering an investigation, would in all likelihood come from competing suppliers rather than end users. After all, who benefits if cheaper imports are hampered? 'The evidence before Merchandise Marks Committee showed that all of these restrictions were decreasing trade, and the House ought to be careful how they multiplied such restrictions.'⁴⁵ Where would it stop? He moved that this bill be taken up six months hence a motion designed to kill the Bill.

Thomas P. Whittaker (L., Spen Valley, West Riding, Yorkshire), newspaper editor, seconded Dalziel's motion, then followed up on Dalziel's question of where all of this would stop. In his slippery slope argument, all trades requiring close work, 'jewelry, paper, toys, laces, silk goods, woolen clothing from Germany, French gloves, American and Swiss Watches, glassware and prints,'⁴⁶ would be candidates for similar protective action.

In fact, the whole principle of the Bill was unsound, and could not be defended from any point of view. He felt that this protective policy of interfering with trade, this policy of worrying industries at every stage had gone very much too far already. They had been making fools of themselves in connection with the Merchandise Marks Act. They had been advertising the foreign manufacturers too much. The mere passing of the bill would be an announcement to the mat and brush buyers of the world that they need not

come to England to purchase them cheaply, because those articles could be bought cheaper elsewhere. This policy of endeavoring to create work by keeping foreign-made goods out of the country was a great mistake. He contended that the importation of cheap articles was a benefit to the masses of the people of the country; and that it did not throw people out of employment.⁴⁷

Sir Charles Vincent rose to answer Whittaker, saying that the departmental committee, appointed two months after the motion had passed, and on which he sat for a while before resigning in frustration, had been stacked against the Bill. Of thirteen giving testimony, both those representing mat makers and brush makers indicated that their members were suffering. Further, he also had a slippery slope argument. Mr. Tower of the embassy in Berlin had made an inquiry and found that German prisons made not just brushes but many other goods and these were as likely to be exported to the U. K. as brushes. The Trades Union Congress supported restrictions on this trade just as they had successfully supported restrictions on the sale of domestically made prison goods.

Back and forth it went. Edward H. Pickersgill, (L of Bethnal Green – South West), a barrister, disagreed with Sir Charles. His understanding from the German government was that the States in their Empire probably would restrict the export of their prison made goods. Further, he had serious questions about the operations of this Bill. John Burns (Socialist, Battersea and Clapham), union leader, followed that in his opinion the workers in his heavily working class constituency, as well as workers in other constituencies, would not support this unnecessary legislation. The

economy was good and this Bill was only aimed at misleading workers as to who had their best interests at heart. He summarized it as a mischievous Bill.

Cuthbert Quilter, (L. U., Suffolk, Sudbury), stated that he was as strong a free trader as any, but as a representative of an area impacted by these imports he could state that his constituents were hurting and looked forward to the passage of this Bill. Edmund Robertson, (L., Dundee), barrister, answered that he was not opposed in principle to this bill, but he was opposed to the processes in the Bill. Thomas H. A. E. Cochrane, (L. U., Ayrshire North), military and government service, wondered how those opposed to the Bill could reconcile the position of opposing this Bill while supporting the prohibition of the sale of domestically produced prison made goods.

Chamberlain arose and in good spirit complimented Mr. Robertson on his singular defense of the previous administration. Chamberlain went on to recite the attempts of the previous administration to avoid either a division on or production of a Bill to fulfill the unanimous order of the Commons for legislation to deal with this issue of foreign prisoner produced goods. Now in opposition they were giving the government a very good go at this Bill, as strong as their opposition to the Primary Education Act (see below). Very well, he said, there will be a division, and the government will be happy to go to the country with the results.

While the economic impact might be small, the principle was large. The opposition had said that this Bill violated the principle of free trade, but the members for Aberdeen South (Bryce, L.) and Montrose (John Morley, L.) had both in the past said that this Bill did not violate free trade. While some might complain that the Bill

would not address those problems that it tries to address, the government believed it will, and the opposition was free to try and improve it.

Bryce replied by appreciating Chamberlain's entertaining speech but went on to point out that few of the Liberal Unionists had run strongly on this issue at the election in 1895 (here Sir Howard intervened that fifty percent of the Liberal Unionists had it in their programs), to which Bryce replied that few of those to whom he talked cared about the issue at all. He continued that the committee had sought input throughout the country, by advertisements, calling on unions, and there was little response. He claimed the committee was impartial (James Lowther (C., Isle of Thanet), disagreed, saying he had repeatedly said it was partial.) Bryce answered the question of the German prison made goods being made for export by saying that in Germany they were not sold in the immediate area of a prison, but were available elsewhere in their Empire. The committee's report indicated that not only were the injuries minor, but the proposed remedies were unworkable. (Sir Howard intervened that there was a minority report that differed from the committee's). Bryce went on:

The Bill was a sham and an imposture from beginning to end ['Cheers' and 'Divide!'] He went further and said that the Bill and the whole of the agitation on this subject had been a piece of demagoguery-[cheers]-which was not creditable to those who practiced it. [Cheers.] He did not think that the Bill could do any harm-[ironical laughter]-but he thought it was not creditable to the House to pass Bills which would do no good, and which would be an unworkable remedy for an insignificant grievance. [Cheers.]⁴⁸

After further arguments by Samuel Hoare, (C., Norwich), banker, and John Lawles, (C., Shoreditch – Haggerston), in favor, and William Allan, (Rad., Gateshead), engineering works owner, and over Sir John Brunner’s (L., Cheshire – Northwich) appeal to the government to improve the language and functioning of the Bill, the vote was called. The Ayes were 223, the Noes 92 (including tellers), and the Bill was referred to the Standing Committee on Trade.

An analysis of the political affiliations, and professions/income sources for those voting finds the information on Table 63:

Table 63
Political affiliation of Division for third reading
Foreign Prison Made Goods Act of 1897

Vote	C.	L. U.	Lib.	Rad.	APIN	PHR	Labour	Other	Total
Ayes	185	31	5	1	-	-	-	1	223
Noes	-	-	61	9	18	-	1	3	92

Totals include two tellers for each the Ayes and Noes.

[Source: Dod’s Parliamentary Companion 1895-1900 and Hansard’s Parliamentary Debates, 1895-1900.]

Table 64
Profession/Income source of Members voting on the division for third reading
Foreign Prison Made Goods Act of 1897

	Ayes	Noes
Businessmen	59	38
Government	28	5
Military	29	2
Barrister	68	19
Solicitor	5	3
Landholder	19	4
Academic	1	4
Medical Doctor	1	3
Writer/Journalist	1	4
Labour	-	4
Other	12	6

[Source: Dod’s Parliamentary Companion 1895-1900 and Hansard’s Parliamentary Debates, 1895-1900.]

On the government side, of 223 voting in the affirmative (221 plus two tellers) 59, or 26.5%, were businessmen; while on the other side, of the 92 voting against the Bill, 38, or 41.3%, were businessmen. Of the total number of 315 members voting, 97 or 30.8% of those voting were businessmen. Thus there were nearly 18% fewer businessmen voting on this issue than would be so at parity since 37.5 % of the members were in business. Table 30 near the beginning of this chapter describes the percentages of business members in each voting block. 34.9% of the Conservative/Liberal Unionists were businessmen, and if one combines the businessmen in the other three political affiliations, Liberal and Radical, Irish Nationalists of various stripes, the percentage of businessmen in opposition to the government is 41.4%. Thus, it is fair to say that while the support for the bill from Conservative and Liberal/Unionists was considerably less than their portion of that political block ($26.5\%/34.9\% = 75.9\%$ of their fair proportion), the percentage of businessmen in opposition nearly exactly matched their proportion of the opposition block.

Table 65
Disaggregation of Businessmen in the vote on the
Foreign Prison Made Goods Act of 1897

	Ayes	Noes
All Businessmen	59	38
Bankers	7	-
Insurance/Other Financial	6	1
Cotton/Wool/Linen	5	9
Steel	5	1
Merchant	7	12
Shipbuilding/Marine Eng.	4	1
Brewery/Distillery	4	1
Colliers	3	3
News Publishing/Publishing	3	4
Railways	2	-
Manufacturing	6	4
Other	7	2

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion 1895-1900 and Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 1895-1900.]

The government's win was overwhelming. But what is interesting is the breakdown of the vote of the businessmen by their occupation. While the overwhelming vote by those in the banking and financial sectors on the Conservative/Liberal Unionist side is not surprising considering the preponderance of those professions affiliated with those parties as seen in Table 65 above, the disproportionately overwhelming support from steel, shipbuilding/marine engineers and brewers and distillers is greater than their percentage of the total in their professions, and the perceived greater vote of the merchant and cloth trades is not particularly greater than their political weight toward the left of the political spectrum, as seen in Table 46.

The Bill was referred to the Standing Committee on Trade. The beginning composition of this committee for the year 1897 had 31 Conservatives, 17 Liberals,

six Liberal Unionists, seven Anti-Parnellite Irish Nationalists, and six others, Radicals, Irish Nationalists, Welsh Nationalists, and a Socialist. Most of the changes in the composition of the committee, over the course of the year, were just trading within each political side of this Parliament. Professionally, there were 36 businessmen originally, 9 barristers, seven landed, four in government, three solicitors, and one each military, medical doctor, educator, other/unknown. As additions and leavings took place over the year, business added one then lost that gain, landholders dropped one, and government increased at the end of the sitting. Table 66 displays the information:

Table 66
Parliament of 1895-1900, House of Commons Standing Committee on Trade,
By Party Affiliation and Profession/Income Source

		C.	L. U.	L.	Rad.	APIN	PHR	Other
Land		3	-	3	-	1	-	-
Gov't		3	-	1	-	-	-	-
Military		1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Barrister		6	1	1	-	1	-	-
Solicitor		2	-	-	-	-	-	1
M. D.		-	-	-	-	1	-	-
Academic		-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Writer		-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Labour		-	-	2	1	-	-	1
Other		-	-	-	-	1	-	-
Business:								
	Bank	1	1	1	-	-	-	-
	Insurance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Other Finance	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Shipping	4	-	1	-	-	-	-
	Railways	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Cotton	2	-	2	-	-	-	-
	Wool	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
	Linen	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Steel	3	3	1	2	-	-	-
	Construction	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Marine Engineering	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
	Telecommunications	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Utility	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Brewery	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Distillery	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
	Colliery	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
	News publication	1	-	-	-	2	1	-
	Other	4	1	-	-	-	-	-

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900 and British Sessional Papers, Parliament of 1895-1900.]

In reviewing the Sessional Papers for 1895-1897, there is no report from this committee. However, in the last sitting of the previous Parliament there had been a report on the Distress for Lack of Employment, in two volumes that undoubtedly set the background for this issue. What is found in the Sessional Papers is the report on

Merchandise Marks which stated that the Act as it stood had stopped much of the problem that it was designed to prevent, that the issue of watches having hidden marks was legitimate and legislation or regulation should require marks to be visible, that foreign goods marketed by British firms should indicate foreign origin by words such as 'sold by,' and that shipments in transit through Great Britain should not be subject to opening.⁴⁹

On 20 July the Bill was brought to the Committee of the Whole. Mr. Lowther assumed the Chair and the Liberals attempted twice to amend the Bill, first to delay its implementation for nine months to allow importers to amend existing contracts to reflect this new law. Mr. Ritchie refused to consider it on the grounds that it would induce shipments of the goods in the meantime. The second amendment, to allow the right of appeal to a court was also rejected by the government, although in the course of the discussion Mr. Ritchie stated that he would consider amending the Bill 'in another place' (Lords). Two divisions took place, with the amendments losing 87 to 182 and 100 to 189. The bill was sent to the House of Lords where there were amendments and both Houses agreed to the Bill in early August.⁵⁰

One reason that Mr. Ritchie might have been reluctant to agree to any amendments was the fate of the Elementary Education Act. Proposed in 1896, the purpose was to try to supplement the revenue stream of the voluntary schools (those usually associated with a church) and the poorer board schools and reorganize the way the national system operated. It was a huge undertaking with debate lasting for days.

Local authorities through the county councils were to be set up over the school boards and were to have authority over the grants to the voluntary schools. The Cowper-Temple amendment, which allowed only 'simple Bible teaching' in rate funded or supported schools, was to be replaced with a clause allowing separate, denominational, religious instruction for the children of parents who requested it. Dissenters, who had been firm supporters of the Cowper-Temple Amendment, were upset, and Church members were bothered by the potential of local government bodies interfering in their schools. However, the possibility of denominational education paid for by the state induced the Irish to vote for a second reading and the Bill passed by a majority of 267, over a hundred greater than the ministerial majority.

Opposition arose, however, from both the Church party and the dissenters. A blizzard of amendments was proposed, almost all of which were dismissed by the minister in charge, Sir John Gorst, Vice-President of the Committee of the Council on Education. Upon the proposition of an amendment which allowed municipal boroughs (instead of County Councils) to appoint their own Educational Committees, Balfour, who had missed a large part of the debate, rose and accepted the amendment for boroughs of population greater than 20,000. This opened arguments about boroughs just short of that number and boroughs that rose above that number then fell, but the most important result was that the flood of amendments just increased.

In spite of its gigantic margin in the vote of 12 May (583 members present and voting, or 87% of the available membership, assuming no vacancies), the government felt compelled to pull the Bill from consideration because of all of the

time it would take to work through the amendments. However, in 1902, the ministry would pass a reform of the Education Act along much of the lines proposed in 1896, including the amendment concerning municipal borough education committees.⁵¹

The last Bill we will look at is the Workmen's Compensation Act of 1897. Under the previous Liberal government, on 20 February 1893 a Bill, entitled the Employer's Liability Bill, was proposed to change the regimen of employers' liability to their employees for accidents. The main point of this Bill was to eliminate the onerous legal concept of common employment, to strengthen employer liability in regards to their workers as exercised through the courts, and end 'contracting out.' Common employment was a concept that had originated through an 1837 case in the common law courts. Under it, an employer could not be held liable for injuries sustained by an employee if another employee of the employer was in part, or in whole, responsible for the injury.⁵² Contracting out was not directly addressed in the Employment Act of 1880, but grew independently into a system in which there was an agreement between an employer and employees (usually exercised through a Friendly Society) to create an insurance fund to compensate injured employees. Though funded largely by employee contributions, usually there was an employer contribution that could rise toward or exceed 40% of yearly contributions.

Asquith opened the debate on 20 February 1893 for the government and Joseph Chamberlain answered for the opposition.⁵³ Asquith reviewed the history of the Employment Acts up to 1893 and then laid out the government's plan eliminating common employment, ending contracting out, and re-enforcing employers' legal

liability. Chamberlain answered that he would propose an amendment: “That no amendment of the Law relating to Employers' Liability will be final or satisfactory which does not provide compensation to workmen for all injuries sustained in the ordinary course of their employment, and not caused by their own acts or default.”⁵⁴ Although this amendment did not prevail, this was the beginning of a long struggle in both Houses which resulted in the government withdrawing the Bill in light of Lords’ amendments which won the support of the House of Commons, but which were against the government’s intentions for the Bill. What the Lords imposed upon the legislation was a ‘safe harbor’ in which employers and employees could set up an actuarially sound system of assurance, outside of the system in the proposed legislation, as long as the employer contributed at least one third of the cost of the plan. On February 20, 1894, a full year to the day after the second reading of the initial Bill (and Asquith’s and Chamberlain’s jousting), Gladstone rose to ask the House of Commons to discharge this Bill.⁵⁵

In 1897, the Conservative led government introduced the Workmen’s Compensation Bill.⁵⁶ Note the title, which reflected the difference in concept. Instead of trying to assess fault and liability the concept of this Bill was to provide recompense for accidents. Nominally under the authority of Sir Matthew White Ridley, Bt., Home Secretary, it was really led by Joseph Chamberlain, Colonial Secretary. Like the previous Liberal Bill, this legislation sought to eliminate the legal concept of common employment, but instead of an adversarial system to determine employers’ responsibility and liability in all cases, this new Bill set up a series of

requirements for major employers to develop a voluntary, arbitrated, 'no fault' (contributory negligence not being a defense for an employer), worker's compensation system; yet the Bill also preserved an employee's right to sue for damages when egregious acts or failure to act by an employer caused the employee's injury. In spite of this change in emphasis from their previous Bill, the Liberal party did not seriously oppose this Bill, although they did spend much time questioning the government on the scope of the Bill.

Initially the Bill was limited to those who were in railway, factory, mine, quarry or engineering work as defined by the Railway Act of 1871; factories (as opposed to workshops) as defined by the Factory and Workshop Acts of 1878 to 1891; docks, wharfs, quays, warehouses as defined in the Workshops Act of 1895; mines as defined by the Coal Mines Act of 1887, and any engineering construction projects utilizing steam driven equipment. But this definition proved difficult. The definition of construction grew to include buildings thirty feet or more in height that required the use of scaffolding. Shipbuilding included moving ships partially built on the water from one shipyard or portion thereof to another (although the Bill was not supposed to include seamen, i.e. those who move a vessel from one place to another on water.) Because of the breadth of the number of employees of railways, it was possible that some who actually worked for a railway company in some capacity might not be covered under the initial draft of the Bill. And, indeed, the government admitted the Bill was designed to cover only 'dangerous' employments.

The opposition argued that the Bill might lead to the unemployment of older workers who might be less able to avoid an accident. The two-week initial exclusion following an accident was decried. Arguments about small employers exclusion was answered that they might be too small and unprofitable to be able to afford any scheme. Questions were raised about sub-contracting. Nevertheless, in spite of all the questions, Liberals admitted that this was a positive step and an improvement over previous Bills. Samuel Woods, (L., Walthamstow), a labour leader who had run on a platform of a compulsory Employers' Liability Bill, said that this was one of the most significant Bills that could be introduced into Parliament, he was comfortable with the idea of a compensation Bill which would benefit so many, and he would work to strengthen and extend the Bill.⁵⁷ Henry Broadhurst, (L., Leicester), stonemason and former member of the Trades Union Congress, said that while he would have preferred another Bill, with amendment this Bill could be of great benefit to the workingman and his family.⁵⁸ Andrew Provand, (L., Glasgow), a manufacturer and occasional contributor to the *Guardian*, likewise acknowledged the positive step that this represented, but nevertheless had a long list of concerns about the Bill.⁵⁹

As noted above, the number of lines of Hansard speeches recorded by the Millbank system can be used to estimate the amount of time various members spoke. There are 23,773 lines of speech recorded on this issue by 192 members. The most voluble was Chamberlain at 3,157 lines, followed by Ridley at 1,378 and the Attorney General, Sir Richard Webster, at 1,257. The leader of the opposition, Asquith, spoke the longest in opposition at 1180 lines (Tables 67 and 68).

Table 67
Lines of Speeches on Workmen's Compensation by party and profession (not including Chamberlain, Ridley, Attorney General and Asquith)

	C.	L.U.	L	Rad.	Other	Total
Business	3006	756	3844	263	-	7869
Government	594	-	443	-	-	1037
Military	99	3	26	51	-	179
Land	46	-	56	-	-	102
Barrister	2062	659	1843	666	-	5230
Solicitor	466	-	124	32	-	622
Labour	-	-	1354	121	373	1848
Other	-	-	14	-	-	14
Total	5853	1418	7704	1133	373	16901

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900 and British Sessional Papers, Parliament of 1895-1900.]

Table 68
Lines of Speeches on Workmen's Compensation by Party and Profession

	C.	L.U.	L.	Rad.	Other	Total
Business	3006	756	3844	263	-	7869
Government	3229	3157	1623	-	-	8009
Military	99	3	26	51	-	179
Land	46	-	56	-	-	102
Barrister	2062	659	1843	666	-	5230
Solicitor	466	-	124	32	-	622
Labour	-	-	1354	121	373	1848
Other	-	-	14	-	-	14
Total	8908	4575	8884	1133	373	23773

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900 and British Sessional Papers, Parliament of 1895-1900.]

Unsurprisingly, businessmen in Table 67, the chart leaving out the main governmental and opposition speakers, spoke the most on this legislation, 7,869 lines out of 16,901 lines, or nearly 46.6%. If we calculate the percentage of all of the speeches, including the leaders, the number is 7,869 of 23,773 lines, or 33.1%, and is just exceeded by government (which includes Asquith, for the opposition) at 8009

lines. However, if Chamberlain is thought of as a businessman who has just assumed another job (albeit, in government), his lines of speech, at 3,157, added to the 7,869 from above becomes 11,026 lines of speech, which is 46.4% of all of the House of Commons argument about this Bill. Clearly this Bill was deeply important to businessmen and their sympathizers.

Table 69
Percentage of speeches on Workmen's compensation by Profession
without Government Leaders

	C.	L.U.	L.	Rad.	Other	Total
Business	38.2	9.6	48.8	3.3		100
Government	57.3		42.7			100
Military	55.3	1.7	14.5	28.5		100
Land	45.1		54.9			100
Barrister	39.4	12.6	35.2	12.7		100
Solicitor	74.9		19.9	5.1		99.9
Labour			73.3	6.5	20.2	100
Other			100			100

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900 and British Sessional Papers, Parliament of 1895-1900.]

Table 70
Percentage of speeches on Workmen's Compensation by Profession
with Government Leaders

	C.	L.U.	L.	Rad.	Other	Total
Business	38.2	9.6	48.8	3.3		100
Government	40.3	39.4	20.3			100
Military	55.3	1.7	14.5	28.5		100
Land	45.1		54.9			100
Barrister	39.4	12.6	35.2	12.7		100
Solicitor	74.9		19.9	5.1		99.9
Labour			73.3	6.5	20.2	100
Other			100			100

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900 and British Sessional Papers, Parliament of 1895-1900.]

If we look at the governing coalition, combining Conservative and Liberal Unionist businessmen's (without Chamberlain's) speeches equals 3762 lines which is just short of Liberal businessmen's speechifying at 3,844, and even shorter compared to the 'left's' combination of Liberals and Radicals at 4107 lines. Tables 69 and 70 recast Tables 67 and 68 as percentages. Expressed as a percentage, of all businessmen's debate on this Bill (excluding Chamberlain), the ruling coalition of Conservative and Liberal Unionist spoke 47.8% of the time and the 'left' coalition spoke 52.2% of the time. (If one were to include Chamberlain, it would be 6919 lines for the Conservatives and Liberal Unionists out of a total of 11,026, or as percentages, 62.8% for the governing coalition versus 37.2 for the opposition. This just re-enforces the importance of Chamberlain.)

However, this legislation was most important to workers. A relatively easy path to financial security in the case of industrial injury was a benefit not to be missed. Labour leaders made up a relatively small portion of the House of Commons (2.4%) but at 1,848 lines of speech, they gave an impressively large 10.9% and 7.8% of the 'backbenchers' speeches and total speeches on this issue.

Two divisions are in the Millbank version of Hansard for this bill. The first was acceptance of a clause exempting workmen from the benefits of the Bill if their injuries were caused by their own willful and negligent disregard of rules and safe procedures. Known as division 218 of 1897, the provision passed 233 to 123, not including the tellers (235 to 125 with tellers) (Tables 71 and 72). The second was

division 281 on contracting out. In this case, the provisions were approved in a vote of 280 to 64 (Tables 73 and 74).

Table 71
Yes Vote on Division 218 including Tellers

	C.	L. U.	L.	Rad.	APIN	PIN	Other	Total
Business	46	15	12	2	-	1	-	76
Government	19	3	2	-	-	-	-	24
Military	37	-	-	-	-	-	-	37
Land	23	2	1	-	-	-	1	27
Barrister	42	11	2	-	-	-	-	55
Solicitor	5	1	-	-	-	-	1	7
M. D.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Academic	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Journalist/writer	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Labour	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	5	1	-	-	-	-	-	6
Total	179	34	17	2	-	1	2	235

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900 and Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 1895-1900.]

Table 72
No Vote on Division 218 including Tellers

	C.	L. U.	L.	Rad.	APIN	PIN	Other	Total
Business	-	2	37	2	12	-	-	53
Government	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	9
Military	1	-	4	1	-	-	-	6
Land	-	-	2	2	2	-	-	6
Barrister	-	-	20	-	2	-	-	22
Solicitor	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	2
M. D.	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	4
Academic	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	3
Journalist/writer	-	-	5	-	2	1	-	8
Labour	-	-	1	-	2	-	1	4
Other	-	-	7	1	-	-	-	8
Total	1	2	89	9	22	1	1	125

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900 and Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 1895-1900.]

Table 73
Yes vote on Division 281, Contracting out

	C.	L. U.	L.	Rad.	APIN	PIN	Other	Total
Business	39	9	39	6	9	-	-	102
Government	11	6	9	-	-	-	-	26
Military	30	1	6	1	-	-	-	38
Land	12	1	2	2	1	1	-	19
Barrister	22	5	23	-	3	-	-	53
Solicitor	3	1	2	1	-	-	1	8
M. D.	1	-	1	1	1	-	-	4
Academic	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	3
Journalist/writer	2	1	5	-	2	-	-	10
Labour	-	-	5	1	-	-	1	7
Other	4	1	3	-	1	1	-	10
Total	125	25	97	12	17	2	2	280

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900 and Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 1895-1900.]

Table 74
No vote on Division 281 Contracting out

	C.	L. U.	L.	Rad.	APIN	PIN	Other	Total
Business	20	5	2	-	-	-	-	27
Government	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
Military	6	1	-	-	-	-	-	7
Land	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
Barrister	16	2	-	-	-	-	-	18
Solicitor	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
M. D.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Academic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Journalist/writer	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Labour	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Other	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Total	53	9	2	-	-	-	-	64

Note: According to the Division Lists the 'no' vote on Division 281 was 63 plus the two tellers, however the detailed listing of those who voted against the proposal as found in Hansard as provided by Millbank system has 62 plus the two tellers.

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900 and Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 1895-1900.]

Seemingly, the logic underlying the issue in the first division was that if employers were still held liable as they were under the existing employment acts (a right which employees retained as a possible remedy to injury under this Bill), then employees should not be rewarded if they blatantly disregarded the employer's safety procedures and were subsequently injured. While 76 businessmen voted for this provision, consisting of 61 businessmen from the governing coalition and fifteen from opposition, 53 businessmen voted against what would seem to be their economic interests. 51 of these 53 were of the opposition and this may reflect their previous support of the more punitive bill of several years before. Labour voted as a block against this provision. Of the 235 in favor, 213 came from the governing coalition, while 122 of the 125 who voted against the Bill came from the opposition. If the purpose of the opposition is to oppose, certainly they did that here; nevertheless, nearly 16% of the Liberals and their associates voting supported this provision. Further, 129 of the 360 members voting were businessmen, or 35.8%.

Likewise, when it came to the issue of contracting out, the issue which wrecked the legislation three years earlier, 130 Liberals and Radicals voted to support what the Liberal led government had deigned to disparage three years before. Interestingly, 48 out of the 150 votes from the governing coalition were businessmen (32%), while the vote in favor of the bill from the opposition benches came from 54 businessmen out of the 130 of the opposition members voting for this bill (or about 41.5%). Among the Conservative businessmen in favor of this Bill were bankers, stockbrokers, brewers, iron and steel company owners, colliers, warehousemen, many

manufacturers of different things, and merchants. Among the Liberal Unionists were a banker, ship owner, brewer, manufacturers and merchants. Those from the opposition benches supporting this legislation included bankers, brewers, colliery owners, iron and steel producers, merchants both large and small, calico printers, foreign and colonial businessmen, and news proprietors.

The two Liberals who voted against contracting out, Emerson Bainbridge and Walter Thorburn, had spoken against the provision and, in Bainbridge's case, owned collieries. While many collieries had set up assurance schemes, there were still many that had not and were deeply concerned about the potential cost and its effect upon the profitability of their enterprises. The types of businesses represented in the no vote on division 281 from the Conservative and Liberal Unionists benches included a banker, two stockbrokers, several in the iron and steel business, two cotton spinners, several colliery owners, and others. Finally, again 129 businessmen voted in this division, this time out of 344, resulting in 37.5% business participation which equals the representation of business in this Parliament.

Chapter Conclusion

In the nearly forty years between the Parliaments of 1852-1857 and this Parliament of 1895-1900 the role of businessmen in the Parliament, and their comfort level with their role, seems to have changed dramatically. As we have seen before, in the mid-century Parliament, businessmen had no Cabinet positions and only one sub-cabinet role of any great importance, Wilson's position of Financial Secretary to the

Treasury. In this later Parliament, former businessmen in the Cabinet included Mssrs. Chamberlain, Ritchie, Hanbury, and Goschen. The number of business members and their percentage of the total had increased dramatically, from over 20% of the total membership to nearly 38%. Further, while there were 17 members in other professions in the earlier Parliament who held corporate board memberships, by this Parliament that number had nearly quadrupled, and the number of members in the government who had held corporate board seats was over sixty (including those held by the large number of Peers in the ministry). Excessive participation by businessmen seems to have dropped off, since their sponsorship of Bills and acceptance of committee assignments was not in excess of their percentage membership in this Parliament. Also, in the divisions we have looked at in detail, in an issue which was a prelude to tariff reform (though it may not have seemed that to all at the time) and therefore assumedly would be of interest to businessmen, and in the two divisions concerning Workmen's Compensation, the turnout by businessmen was less than their percentage in the Parliament.

Many members of the business class had been accepted into some of the highest levels of society. Henry Fairlie in his column of 23 September 1955 in the *Spectator* described the mechanism through which power was exercised in Britain as being a 'matrix of official and social relations within which power is exercised.' His name for it was 'the establishment.' These end-of-the-Victorian-era businessmen had in some cases attended public schools and university, in most cases belonged to at least one gentlemen's club, and in many cases to several. A surprisingly large

number of those in the financial area belonged to one of the more prestigious clubs. Businessmen had been and would continue to be in increasing numbers honored with knighthoods and baronetages and many even would be elevated into the peerage. And in little ways, business had been accepted. In the earlier Parliament, one of the businessmen complained of inconvenient sittings, much to the scorn of Palmerston. In this Parliament, Balfour would repeatedly apologize for late sittings. All in all, the relative position and acceptance of business, its interests, and its place in society had improved considerably. Businessmen had indeed become a part of the establishment.

Chapter Three

Comparison and Contrasts between the Parliament of 1852-1857

and the Parliament of 1895-1900

In the nearly forty years which separated the Parliament of 1852 to 1857 from the last of Victoria's Parliaments, 1895-1900, significant changes had occurred in the United Kingdom and in the Parliament. While the number occupying seats in the House of Commons was nearly the same, 779 in the five years mid-century and 765 at the end of the century, the number of full time businessmen who were MPs had increased nearly 80% from 160 to 287 and the number of those in other professions which we can trace to board seats or other more direct business interests nearly quadrupled from 17 to 59.

This finding is in line with other studies. James Cook Hamilton, in his dissertation "Parties and Voting Patterns in the Parliament of 1874-1880",¹ found that of 796 Members of Parliament who sat at Westminster from 1874 to 1880, 188 or 24% were businessmen, and in particular 16 of these businessmen MPs were bankers, 31 manufacturers, 49 merchants, 34 had multiple interests, and 58 had 'other' interests including 14 brewers, 13 iron masters, seven railway chairmen or directors, five colliery or quarry men, two builders, two accountants, and assorted others. Sixty-five of the businessmen were conservatives, 112 liberals, seven Home Rulers, and four Radicals. We can create a table (75) representing the businessmen in these three Parliaments:

Table 75
The Number of Businessmen in the Parliaments of 1852-57, 1874-1880,
and 1895-1900 by their party affiliation

	Parliament of 1852-1857		Parliament of 1874-1880		Parliament of 1895-1900	
	Conser-vatives	Liberals, Whigs, Radicals, and others	Conser-vatives	Liberals, Whigs, Radicals, and others	Conser-vatives and Liberal Unionists	Liberals, Whigs, Radicals, and others
Businessmen	56	118	65	123	160	127

[Sources: Dod's Parliamentary Companion 1852-1857 and 1895-1900, and Hamilton, 'Parties and Voting Patterns in the Parliament of 1874-1880.']

It is clear that the significant increase in the numbers and percentage of businessmen in Parliament occurred after the 1874 election. Although one might attribute this increase to the electoral reforms of 1883, 1884 and 1885 (Bills concerning corrupt practices, extending the franchise, and redistribution of seats, respectively), which increased the franchise to two out of three males of eligible age and increased the representation of the north of England; William C. Lubenow, in his book Parliamentary Politics and the Home Rule Crisis,² found that the percentage of businessmen elected to the Parliament in the election of 1886 was 27%, down slightly from the previous election.³ As noted in the previous chapter, the percentage of those in the Parliament of 1895-1900 that were businessmen was over 37%. What this implies is a trend growing over the last half of the nineteenth century as businessmen steadily increased their membership in Parliament from over 20% in mid-century, to 24% a quarter of a century later to 27% in the election of 1886, then increasing more rapidly in the succeeding decade to exceed 37% in the Parliament of 1895-1900.

The other noticeable phenomenon is the movement of businessmen into the Conservative party. In mid-century, just under one third of the businessmen in the Parliament were in the Conservative Party, which was also true at the end of the third quarter of the century, but by the end of the century, in this last Parliament of Victoria, the contingent of businessmen in the Conservative party were over fifty-five percent of the total number of businessmen in the Parliament. Reasons that have been given for this include the breakup of the liberal coalition over home rule for Ireland (keeping Ireland in the United Kingdom for many in Great Britain would be patriotic and above partisanship), and the leftward movement in the Liberal camp caused by the rise of the labour movement.

In the last fifteen years of the nineteenth century, the labour movement became radicalized as socialism came to the fore. If labour opposed business and business ownership, then a commonality of property interests with the landed (who were, after all, often entrepreneurial in their outlook) would result in businessmen being attracted to the Conservatives. Further, as seen in the previous chapter, the percentage of businessmen in the Liberal Unionist party, the other portion of the governing coalition in this Parliament, was greater than in the Conservative party. A little over a decade after the end of this Parliament, these two parties would merge.

In the second half of the nineteenth century many of those who became businessmen attended public schools. Below are two tables, the first (76) is a table

listing the attendance by the Parliamentarians of 1852-1857 and the second (77) is the attendance by those in the Parliament of 1895-1900.

Table 76
Percentage of Attendance at Clarendon and Other Public Schools
by Profession/Income Source
Parliament of 1852-1857

Profession	Clarendon Schools	Other Public Schools	Total
Government Service	59.4	3.0	62.4
Land Ownership	50.2	.4	50.6
Military	36.0	1.1	37.1
Barrister	30.8	6.5	37.3
Writer / Journalists	12.5	0	12.5
Solicitor	0	0	0
Medical Doctor	0	0	0
Other / Unknown	39.4	0	39.4
Business aggregated	18.1	3.8	21.9
Banker	30.0	0	30.0
Insurance/Other Finance	33.3	0	33.3
Shipping	0	0	0
Railways	33.3	0	33.3
Cotton	0	0	0
Wool	0	0	0
Linen	33.3	0	33.3
Steel/Iron	14.3	0	14.3
Construction	0	0	0
Shipbuilding/Marine Eng.	0	0	0
Utility	50.0	0	50.0
Brewer	66.7	0	66.7
Colliery	0	0	0
Publishers and Printers	14.3	28.6	43.1
Other	8.3	3.3	11.6

[Sources: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1852-1857.]

Table 77
Percentage of attendance at Clarendon and other Public Schools
by Profession/Income Source
Parliament of 1895-1900

Profession / Income Source	Clarendon Schools	Other Public Schools	Total
Government Service	69.4	8.0	77.4
Land Ownership	67.1	4.3	71.4
Military	52.2	13.0	65.2
Education	33.3	25.0	58.3
Barrister	31.5	12.7	44.2
Writer / Journalists	29.4	11.8	31.2
Solicitor	9.0	9.0	18.0
Medical Doctor	8.0	8.0	16.0
Other / Unknown	20.6	11.8	32.4
Labour	0	0	0
Business aggregated	19.4	10.1	29.5
Banker	45.0	17.5	62.5
Insurance/Other Finance	23.5	17.6	41.1
Shipping	4.2	4.2	8.4
Railways	27.6	6.9	34.5
Cotton	5.3	10.5	15.8
Wool/Linen	11.1	11.1	22.2
Linen	0	0	0
Steel/Iron	4.3	17.5	21.8
Construction	0	12.5	12.5
Shipbuilding/Marine Eng.	11.1	33.3	44.4
Telecom	50.0	0	50.0
Utility	0	0	0
Brewer	60.0	0	60.0
Distillers	40.0	20.0	60.0
Colliery	25.0	16.7	41.7
Publishers and Printers	22.2	0	22.2
Other	8.7	13.6	22.3

[Sources: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900.]

Whereas the percentage of businessmen in the Parliament of 1852-1857 who had been educated in Clarendon schools was 18%, and the percentage of those who had been educated at any public schools was just short of 22%, by the later Parliament almost 19.5% of the businessmen seated in the Parliament of 1895-1900

had been educated at Clarendon Schools, and nearly 30% of these businessmen MPs had been educated at any of the public schools. The rise in Clarendon school attendance was nearly 8% while the rise in attendance at other public schools was from 3.8% of the businessmen in mid century to 10.9%, or nearly a tripling, by the end of the century. Relative to the other professions/income sources, businessmen in 1852-1857 in Clarendon school attendance ranked only ahead of Writers/Journalists, Solicitors, and Medical Doctors, and in the Parliament of 1895-1900 they ranked ahead of Solicitors, Medical Doctors, Labour, and just behind Other/Unknown.

However, if one disaggregates the education of the businessmen in different fields of business, one finds some consistency in the types of schools attended by different types of businessmen in the two Parliaments. In the Parliament of 1852-1857, 30% of bankers, one-third of those in insurance and other finance, one-third of those associated with railways, one-third in linen trades, two-thirds of brewers, half of those in utilities, and a seventh of those in steel and iron and printing and publishing had attended public schools, and an additional two-sevenths of printers and publishers attended other public schools. Forty years later, 45% of bankers, 23.5% of those in other finance, 27.6% of those associated with railways, 60% of brewers, 22.2% of printers and publishers, and 4.3% of those in steel had attended Clarendon schools. Those who attended non-Clarendon public schools totaled 17.5% bankers, 17.5% other finance, 6.9% railways, no brewers and no publishers and 17.5% in steel. Linen and utilities had no public school attendees amongst their number in the later Parliament. Thus, in total, 62.5% of the bankers, 41% of those in other finance,

34.5% of those in railroads, 60% of brewers, and 22.2% of printers and publishers, and almost 22% of those in iron and steel had attended public schools. Public school attendance amongst bankers had doubled, other finance had increased by 25%, steel and iron businessmen had increased nearly fifty percent in spite of a dramatic drop in attendance at Clarendon schools, railways had increased marginally, brewer's attendance was down 11%, the category of printers and publishers was down by about half, and linen and utilities were gone. Those in shipping, cotton, wool, construction, marine engineering, and collieries had no public school attendees in the mid-century Parliament, but public school attendance had increased to 4.2% Clarendon and 4.2% at other public schools for those in shipping, 5.3% and 10.5% in cotton, 11.1% and 11.1% in wool, 11.1% and 33.3% in shipbuilding/marine engineering, and to 25% and 16.7% in collieries.

Further, comparing the disaggregated business attendance rates compared to the other profession/income source, among the Parliamentarians in the earlier Parliament, brewers attended Clarendon Schools in a greater percentage than any other category at 66.7%; followed by those in government service at 59.4%; land owners at 50.2%; those involved in utilities, 50%; other/unknown, 39.4%; military, 36%; insurance/other finance, railways men, and linen at 33.3% each; barristers at 30.8%, and bankers at 30.0%. Total public school attendance, Clarendon and all other public schools, mirrors the above order only with barristers rising in the order to just ahead of the military. By the end of the century, the order for Clarendon School attending Parliamentarians was government service, land owners, brewers, military,

telecommunications, bankers, distillers, education, barrister, writer/journalists, railway men, colliery owners, and insurance/other finance. Including other public schools, the order is government service, land owners, military, bankers, brewers and distillers tied, education, shipbuilding/marine engineering, barrister, colliery owners, and insurance/other finance.

Three phenomena are of note. First, of the Members of Parliament, those in certain old businesses, banking, finance, and brewing, attracted public school graduates for some time and continued to at increasing rates through the end of the nineteenth century. Second, railways, a business which arose toward the end of the first third of the nineteenth century, was so attractive that a substantial number of public school attendees chose to be involved with the industry from early on in the industry's existence and it continued to attract public school graduates throughout the rest of the century.⁴ Third, other industries such as wool, linen, cotton, iron and steel, and marine engineering/shipbuilding had few public school boys in their Parliamentary ranks in mid-century, and although the MPs in these businesses who had graduated from public schools had increased by the end of the century, this increase was not to the level of the bankers and others. Clearly there was an educational bifurcation concerning secondary school within the ranks of businessmen MPs.

Attendance at university or other higher-educational institute (including medical school and military college) shows businessmen MPs increasing attendance

from 21.3% of those in the Parliament of 1852-1857 to 43.4% of those in our later Parliament. Below is a table (78) outlining university attendance by those in the Parliament of 1895-1900.

Table 78
Percentage of each Professional Category of the Members of the House of Commons
In the Parliament Of 1895-1900 who attended University

Profession	Oxford	Cambridge	Other	Total
Land	36.0	21.3	4	61.3
Government Service	42.0	28.0	8.0	68.0
Military	16.4	7.5	25.4	49.3
Barrister	37.8	29.7	41.9	<100.0*
Solicitor	0	4.5	40.7	45.2
Medical Doctors	0	0	146.2*	100.0*
Academic	27.3	18.2	54.6	100.0
Writer	17.6	17.6	41.4	76.6
Labor	0	0	0	0
Other	30.3	21.7	12.1	64.1
Business Aggregated	8.7	14.3	20.4	43.4
Business Disaggregated:				
Bank	20.0	30.0	20.0	70.0
Insurance	0	0	0	
Other Financial	7.7	23.1	7.7	38.5
Shipping	16.7	11.1	22.2	50.0
Railway	33.3	11.1	22.2	66.6
Cotton	5.6	0	50.0	55.6
Wool	12.5	0	25.0	37.5
Linen	0	0	0	0
Steel	7.7	7.7	15.4	30.8
Construction	0	0	0	0
Shipbuilding/Marine Engineering	0	22.2	44.4	66.6
Telecom	50.0	0	0	50.0
Brewery	0	20.0	13.4	33.4
Distillery	0	40.0	20.0	60.0
Utility	0	50.0	0	50.0
Colliery	8.3	33.3	16.7	58.3
News Publishers	5.3	0	15.8	21.1
Other	7.9	13.8	15.9	37.8

*Note: Ten of 172 Barristers did not attend university (94% therefore did), while others attended more than one. All MDs attended university, often more than one.

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900.]

If we disaggregate those businessmen in the later Parliament, fifty percent of the bankers attended Oxford and Cambridge, with total university attendance for bankers reaching 70% including Scottish and foreign universities. Those associated with railroads had the next highest percentage, 44.4% attending 'Oxbridge' schools and another 22.2% attending other universities, bringing their total percentage to 66.6%. Marine engineering was 22.2% 'Oxbridge' and 66.6% total, Shipping was 27.8% and 61.2%, distillers 40% and 60%, colliery owners or managers 41.6% and 58.2%, cotton 5.6% and 55.7%, both utility and telecommunications at 50% and 50%, other finance at 30.8% and 38.5%, the catch-all of 'other' at 21.7% and 37.6%, wool at 12.5% and 37.5%, brewers at 20% and 33.4%, steel at 15.4% and 30.8%, news publication at 5.3% and 21.1% and on down to no university graduates in insurance, linen, and construction.

Compared to the other professions/income groups, bankers are fifth, at seventy percent university attendance, behind Medical Doctors and academicians, both at 100% attendance, barristers with nearly 100% attendance, and writers/journalists at over 76%. Government Service is next at 68%, followed by railway men, those in ship construction, both at 66.6%, and distillers at 60%.

Over the course of the second half of the nineteenth century, university education increasingly became an accomplishment of those who then went into business. As we have seen before, compared to their contemporaries, bankers were always highly educated and railroads attracted the well educated almost from their beginning. Marine engineering required advanced training, and seemingly those who

entered the shipping, distilling, coal and cotton trades by the end of the century often had had a chance to attend university.

During the second half of the nineteenth century the number of private gentlemen's clubs increased significantly as the demand for club memberships increased for both businessmen and others. The non-political, non-military social clubs that were listed in 1895 but are not found in the membership lists of the Parliamentarians in 1852 include Bath, Marlborough, St. James, Savile, Pratts, St. Stephens and Hurlingham. This increase in the number of clubs over the course of the second half of the nineteenth century is in itself notable.

Below, from chapters 1 (Table 79) and 2 (Table 80), are the social club memberships of our MPs:

Table 79
Non-Political Club Memberships by Profession/
Income Category in percentage terms
Parliament of 1852-1857

	Gov't.	Land	Military	Barr.	Solic.	M.D.	Other	Bus.
Clubs:								
Military	3.0	6.8	40.2	1.0	-	-	1.0	0
University	8.5	7.6	2.3	23.4	-	-	19.2	2.5
Intell./travel	22.2	33.3	16.1	19.6	-	-	17.3	8.1
Social	5.1	6.0	6.9	12.1	25	-	12.5	12.5
Upper Level Social	39.3	27.3	23.0	10.3	-	-	16.3	8.8

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1852-1857.]

Table 80
Non-Political Club Memberships by Profession/
Income Category in percentage terms
Parliament of 1895-1900

	Gov't	Land	Mil.	Barr.	Solic	M.D	Write	Acad	Othe	Labo	Bus.
Clubs:											
Military	10.2	5.6	49.3	2.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.8
University	8.2	4.2	1.4	18.0	-	8.0	11.8	16.7	2.9	-	4.9
Intell./travel	24.5	15.3	4.3	21.5	9.0	8.0	23.5	33.3	11.8	-	5.2
Social	53.1	34.7	50.7	29.4	9.0	-	11.8	8.3	23.5	-	33.5
Upper Level Social	34.7	36.1	39.1	13.6	4.5	-	5.9	16.7	23.5	-	11.1

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900.]

Aggregating these numbers, nearly 32% of the businessmen in the earlier Parliament were members of these clubs, while by the end of the century over 55% were in these clubs. In both cases, except for membership in clubs in the two categories associated with the intellect (university and intellectual/travel) businessmen seem to come close to mirroring the barristers in their memberships. The membership in these non-political social clubs by businessmen compared to barristers in our two Parliaments is as follows:

Table 81
Non-Political Club Memberships of Businessmen
compared to Barristers in the Parliament of 1852-1857

	Barristers	Business
Clubs:		
Military	1.0	0
University	23.4	2.5
Intell./travel	19.6	8.1
Social	12.1	12.5
Upper Level Social	10.3	8.8

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1852-1857.]

Table 82
Non-Political Club Memberships of Businessmen
compared to Barristers in the Parliament of 1895-1900

	Barrister	Business
Clubs:		
Military	2.3	2.8
University	18.0	4.9
Intell./travel	21.5	5.2
Social	29.4	33.5
Upper Level Social	13.6	11.1

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900.]

With university education more common for businessmen in the course of the century, one can see the nearly doubling of the percentage of businessmen in the university club category. Interestingly the percentage of businessmen in the intellectual/travel club category fell during the same time resulting in practically a static percentage in each Parliament belonging to these somewhat related categories. (2.5% university and 8.1% intellectual/travel, which totals 10.6% in 1852-57, versus 4.9% and 5.2% or 10.1%, combined in 1895-1900.) Further, the increases in the percentages in the social and upper level social clubs over time by the two income categories are fairly close. Businessmen in the social club category increased from 12.5% in 1852-57 to 33.5%, or an increase of 168%, while barristers increased from 12.1% to 29.4%, or an increase of 143%; while in the upper level social club category, businessmen increased their percentage by 26% (8.8% increasing to 11.1%) while barristers increased by 32% (10.3% increasing to 13.6%). Overall, if the social categories are combined, businessmen increased their memberships from 21.3% to 44.6% of their population, while barristers increased from 22.4% to 43%. Overall,

businessmen increased their relative percentage membership in social and high level social clubs when compared to barristers by only 2.7% over these four decades.

Digging deeper by disaggregating the businessmen by their specific professions we find (Table 83 for Parliament of 1852-1857 and Table 84 for the Parliament of 1895-1900):

Table 83
Non-Political Club Memberships of Businessmen Disaggregated by Profession,
Parliament of 1852-1857

	Bankers and Finance	Other Business
Clubs:		
Military	-	-
University	0	2.5
Intellectual/travel	12.1	7.1
Social	12.1	12.5
Upper Level Social	9.1	8.7

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1852-1857.]

Table 84
Non-Political Club Memberships of businessmen disaggregated by profession,
Parliament of 1895-1900

	Bankers	Bankers and Other Finance	Other Business
Clubs:			
Military	6.7	4.8	.4
University	6.7	8.1	4.0
Intellectual/travel	20.0	11.3	3.6
Social	47.0	38.7	32.0
Upper Level Social	23.3	25.8	7.1

[Source: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900.]

In the period of 1852-1857, bankers and finance were 26% more likely to belong to university or intellectually oriented clubs than were other businessmen (12.1% in intellectual/travel for bankers and financiers versus 2.5% and 7.1% for

intellectual/travel or 9.6% combined for other businessmen), while in our later Parliament, bankers and financiers when compared to other businessmen, were twelve times more likely to belong to military clubs than other businessmen (implying that finance had become a second career for many retired military), twice as likely to belong to university clubs, over three times as likely to belong to intellectually oriented clubs, twenty percent more likely to have been in social clubs, and more than three times as likely to have belonged to the upper level of social clubs. Breaking out the bankers from those others in finance, bankers are more likely to belong to military clubs, nearly 80% more likely to belong to intellectual/travel clubs, but twenty percent less likely to belong to university clubs, over twenty percent more likely to belong to social clubs but ten percent less likely to belong to upper level clubs.

If we compare the social club mix of the bankers to the barristers from the Parliament of 1895-1900, we find that the barristers are still much more involved with university clubs, (6.7% bankers to 18% barristers) but the intellectual/travel clubs do not show that large a divergence (20% bankers versus 21.5% barristers), and the bankers have a much greater membership in social (47% versus 29.4% and upper level social (23.3% versus 13.6%) clubs.

Honors received are another way of understanding the perception of the recipients by the larger society within which they resided. The tables below from chapters one (table 85) and two (Table 86) list the percentage of different professions receiving honors:

Table 85
Percentage of those Members of Different Professions
in the Parliament of 1852-1857 who received Honors

	Knighthood	Baronetage	Peerage
Businessmen	0	5.0	1.0
Government	10.4	17.9	29.9
Military	13.8	8.0	12.6
Landholding	2.6	12.8	29.9
Barrister	1.9	10.3	3.7
Writers/Journalists	0	0	12.5
Other/Unknown	0	12.4	5.7

Table 86
Percentage of those Members of Different Professions
in the Parliament of 1895-1900 who received Honors

	Knighthood	Baronetage	Peerage
Businessmen	19.2	19.9	11.1
Government	23.1	17.3	48.1
Military	25	16.2	22
Landholding	10	14.1	21.1
Barrister	22.1	13.4	15.7
Solicitor	0	0	4.5
Academics	33	8.3	8.3
Medical Doctors	16	8	8
Writers/Journalists	5.9	5.9	11.8
Labour	5	0	0
Other	3	12.1	12.1

First, it becomes apparent that the number of honors granted to those who served in Parliament increased significantly over the last half of the nineteenth century (‘gong-flation?’) and the distribution grew to include more groups, including even someone in the later Parliament associated with labour.

Second, while there were more honors granted to everyone, business was one of the categories that saw the greatest increase. A table (87) can be produced which lists the combined percentages of all honors for each income category for both the mid-century Parliament and the end of the century Parliament.

Table 87
Comparison between the Parliaments of 1852-57 and 1895-1900 of the Percentage of different Profession/Income Categories Receiving Honors

	Parliament of 1852-1857	Parliament of 1895-1900
Businessmen	6.0	50.2
Government	58.2	88.5
Military	34.4	63.2
Landholding	45.3	45.2
Barrister	15.9	51.2
Solicitor	0	4.5
Academics	N/A	49.7
Medical Doctors	0	32.0
Writers/Journalists	12.5	23.6
Labour	N/A	5.0
Other	18.1	27.2

First, we see that solicitors got some recognition and Medical Doctors received a substantial amount of recognition by the end of the century as opposed to no recognition at the middle of the century. Labour and academicians, which emerged as separate categories between these two Parliaments, also received some recognition – labour, a lone knighthood, academicians a number of knighthoods as

well as a smattering of other honors. All other categories, with the exception of landholding, which stayed about the same, saw increases in honors: military increasing by 90%, journalists and writers by about 90%, ‘other’ by 50%, and government by about 60%. However, barristers and business saw much more substantial increases. Barristers more than tripled their number of honors and businessmen increased their honors by well in excess of a factor of eight.

With their large numbers, and high percentage of honors, even if the types of honors were slightly lower in the social hierarchy (that is, more knighthoods and baronetages as opposed to peerages) than some of the other older categories, these businessmen as a category clearly have to be seen as substantial beneficiaries of the change of perception of business in British society. However, we can look a bit deeper here as well. Table 88 shows the following distribution of honors:

Table 88
Honors Bestowed on Businessmen who sat in the Parliament of 1895 to 1900:

	Before 1895	1895 - 1900	After 1900
Knighthoods	15	10	18
Baronetages	10	14	33
Peerages	---	4	28

Sources: Dod’s Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900, The Dictionary of National Biography, Boase’s Modern English Biography, Boylan’s Dictionary of Irish Biography, the British Biographical Archive: Seventeenth through the Nineteenth Centuries, and the Dictionary of Business Biography.]

In addition to the information concerning the businessmen’s honors in the chart above, there were one KCB, two CBs, one KCSI, one KIE, one CIE, three GCMGs, five KCMGs, two CMGs, one GBE, and one OBE given to these business MPs.

If we break out those in banking and finance we get Tables 89 and 90:

Table 89
Honors bestowed on Bankers who sat in the Parliament of 1895 to 1900:

	Before 1895	1895 - 1900	After 1900
Knighthoods	0	0	1
Baronetages	6	1	2
Peerages	---	2	3

[Sources: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900, The Dictionary of National Biography, Boase's Modern English Biography, Boylan's Dictionary of Irish Biography, the British Biographical Archive: Seventeenth through the Nineteenth Centuries, and the Dictionary of Business Biography.]

In addition, one each KCSI and one KCMG were granted before 1895, and a GCMG in 1897.

Table 90
Honors Bestowed on Those in Other Finance/Insurance who sat in the Parliament of 1895 to 1900:

	Before 1895	1895 - 1900	After 1900
Knighthoods	0	1	4
Baronetages	1	3	5
Peerages	---	0	6

[Sources: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900, The Dictionary of National Biography, Boase's Modern English Biography, Boylan's Dictionary of Irish Biography, the British Biographical Archive: Seventeenth through the Nineteenth Centuries, and the Dictionary of Business Biography.]

In addition one KIE was granted in 1920.

Bankers, insurance and other finance make up about 16% of the businessmen in the Parliament of 1895-1900. While they received none of the knighthoods granted before this Parliament and only one out of ten granted during the Parliament, they received five of eighteen granted after the term of this Parliament (27.8%), resulting

in these business MPs receiving almost 14% of the knights bachelor granted to businessmen. Further, of twelve knighthoods granted through Orders to businessmen, these financiers received five, or 33.3%. Thus, of all knighthoods granted to businessmen in this Parliament, bankers and financiers received over 27.5%, which is about 80% above their fair proportion of the business MPs in this Parliament. In the higher honors, those in banking and finance also did well. Seven of ten baronetages granted before 1895 (70%), four of fourteen granted during this Parliament (28.6%), seven of thirty-three bestowed after the term of this Parliament (21.2%) were awarded to those associated with finance. In aggregate, these bankers and financial men received 31.6% of all baronetages granted or inherited by the businessmen who were in this Parliament. The bankers and financiers also received two of the four peerages granted or inherited during the Parliament (50%), and nine of twenty-eight peerages granted or inherited after the term of this Parliament (32.1%). This totals 34.4% of all of these businessmen-held peerages. Thus we can definitively say that the 16% of the business MPs in the Parliament of 1895-1900 who were in banking or finance disproportionately received honors, and that the honors bestowed upon those businessmen in banking, insurance, and finance who sat in this last Parliament of the nineteenth century were skewed toward the higher end of the honors, disproportionately baronetages and peerages, when compared with the honors given to other businessmen. Finally, nearly 72% of those in banking or finance received at least one honor, while some received more than one. For example, Philipps received a peerage and then inherited his father's baronetage, Sir James Kitson, Bt. was given

a baronetcy in 1886 and elevated to the peerage in 1907, and E. F. G. Hatch was granted a baronetcy in 1908 and a KIE in 1920.

Bankers and those in finance benefitted disproportionately from the acceptance of business by British society. Those in the last Parliament of the century attended public schools in percentages not far removed from those in old traditional professions. Banker's club memberships were similar to government members and landholders, and those in banking and other finance were close to barristers or 'other' in their profile of club membership, leaving the remainder of the businessmen somewhat behind military and barristers but well ahead writers and solicitors in the percentage and types of clubs that they belonged to. Finally, honors granted to businessmen in this later Parliament as opposed to our earlier one show a dramatic increase, far more than almost any other group, but the types of honors were skewed a bit toward the lesser honors. However, again, those in banking and finance were privileged with types and rates of honors which ranked between the percentage of honors given to the older professions/income sources of government and military (as found in Table 87.)

In the Parliament of 1852-1857, businessmen held only one office of any great consequence, Wilson as Financial Secretary to the Treasury, a sub-cabinet post. By the Parliament of 1895-1900 businessmen had held cabinet appointments in recent Parliaments and in this most land oriented administration of Salisbury, held four important positions: Joseph Chamberlain, formerly head of Nettlefolds and Chamberlain who was Secretary of State for the Colonies; George Goschen, Sr.,

formerly a partner in Fruhling and Goschen, bankers, First Lord of the Admiralty; Charles T. Ritchie, formerly with his family's jute business, was now President of the Board of Trade; and R. W. Hanbury, retired landholder and mine owner and manager, was Financial Secretary to the Treasury.

Yet while businessmen occupied more and more important positions in the government, businessmen seem to have been less involved as backbenchers in the business of the House of Commons. In the Parliament of 1852-1857 we found that businessmen greatly exceeded their fair proportion of the House of Commons on five of the categories of committees, Local (35%), Foreign Affairs (33%), Government Finance (31%), Business and Economics (29%), and Education and Culture (28%), were a little under but close to their fair representation on four committees: Empire (21%), Social (20%), Government Administration (19%) and Parliament (19%), but were short on the remaining issues Irish Issues (15%), Judiciary (13%), Religion (10%), Military (10%) and Scottish Issues (0%).

Sponsorship of bills is also a way of determining participation and here businessmen in the Parliament of 1852-1857 exceeded their fair proportion in three subjects: Government Finance wherein they were 32% of the sponsors, Government Administration, 30%, and Education and Culture at 29%. Business and Economics at 22% and Scottish Issues at 20% were close to their percentage in the House of Commons, and then their sponsorship fell dramatically to Empire at 13%, Social, Religion, and Foreign Affairs each at about 11%, Judiciary and Parliament at 10%, Irish Issues at 9%, Local at 4%, and no sponsorship of Military bills.

By analyzing the voting pattern in our earlier Parliament we were able to determine that businessmen appeared to have attended House of Commons sessions more regularly and to a greater degree than their proportion of the House. In low vote divisions they exceeded their fair proportion of the House by as much as twenty-five percent, and in the largest divisions (total votes greater than 300) they also exceeded their proportion of the House, albeit only slightly. Clearly businessmen in the Parliament of 1852-1857 must have felt that they needed to be more attentive either to have their positions expressed and/or to be accepted as players in the House of Commons.

In the Parliament of 1895-1900, businessmen were well represented in the Cabinet and the Government. On committees, businessmen (at approximately 37.5% of the membership of this Parliament) were over represented on the committees dealing with Local issues at 54%, Business/Economy/Trade at 46%, Government Finance at 45%, Military and Navy at 39% and Scots at 39%, approximately fairly represented on committees dealing with Scots issues at 37% and progressively underrepresented on committees dealing with Religion at 35%, Irish at 34%, Government Administration at 29%, Parliamentary at 23%, Education and Culture at 20%, Empire at 17%, and Judicial at 11%. Foreign Affairs had no committees.

Business sponsorship of legislation shows that they exceeded their proportion (37.5%) of the membership in this later Parliament on only one category, Social, at 38.3%, were close at 35.5% for bills dealing with Scottish issues, and then fell of to

33.9% for Business/Economy/Trade, and 30.7% for Education and Culture. The rest were much lower in business sponsorship.

Since there were a relatively large number of businessmen and former businessmen in this government, the members of the government were reallocated back to their original profession. With this done, business sponsorship of bills dealing with Foreign Affairs, at 43.2%, was the highest ranked, followed by Social at 40.4%, Scots at 38.4%, Business/Economics/Trade at 37.6%, Government Administration at 35.2%, Local at 35%, Empire at 33.3%, Education and Culture at 32.2% and the rest trailing behind at below thirty percent. Thus, in order to get any significant excess business sponsorship of bills, we must reallocate former businessmen from government service back to their original career.

Finally, since we could not replicate the earlier study's finding concerning the percentage of businessmen voting in the divisions on the bills, due to lack of available information, we had to rely upon several divisions of the House of Commons taken on issues important to businessmen to try and determine their regular attendance in Parliament. On the division for the third reading of the Foreign Prison Made Goods Act of 1897, in which the identities of the MPs voting is noted, the percentage of those voting who were businessmen was 30.8%. This was an issue of some interest to businessmen. It should be noted, however, that the shortfall in the percentage of businessmen voting must be laid at the feet of the businessmen in the governing coalition. The businessmen MPs of the governing coalition of Conservatives and Liberal Unionists totaled 34.9% of the coalition's membership, yet supplied only

26.5% of the votes from the Conservatives and Liberal Unionists parties, whereas the Liberal party led opposition (Liberals, Radicals, Anti-Parnellite Irish Nationalists and Parnellite Home Rulers) which included 41.4% businessmen in their ranks, produced a vote, that was practically spot on, with 41.3% business participation.

In the case of the Workmen's Compensation Act, two divisions were studied. The first, on a provision to exclude workmen from the benefits of the bill if they had willfully or negligently disregarded their employer's work and safety rules, showed a vote of 360 members (including tellers), 129, or 35.8% of whom were businessmen. This is fairly close to the percentage of the businessmen in the Parliament. In the other division, this one on contracting out, the percentage of businessmen voting (37.5%) was approximately the same as the percentage in the Parliament. Thus, in light of the three divisions above, all of which were on issues that were of interest to businessmen, it can be suggested that attendance by businessmen in this later Parliament, as opposed to our earlier Parliament probably was not as disproportionately large as was their attendance in the Parliament of 1852 to 1857, and indeed may very well have been less than their fair proportion.

To summarize the research, in the middle of the nineteenth century, businessmen made up well over twenty percent of the membership of the Parliament, but they held no Cabinet positions in the government and only one sub-Cabinet post. Businessmen were over-represented on committees of five of the fourteen subjects, fairly represented on two and under-represented on the remainder. Businessmen's sponsorship of bills was greater than their fair representation in three subject areas

only. And, as we have noted, businessmen were very attentive in their attendance in the House.

In the later Parliament businessmen held substantial governmental positions, exceeded their percentage, in a few cases greatly, on committees dealing with Local issues, Business issues, Government Finance, the Military, and Scottish issues, but exceeded their fair representation on only Bills dealing with Social issues.

Businessmen do not seem to have attended Parliament to any greater degree than their numbers warranted.

Socially, businessmen had made, and would continue to make, great strides. They attended public schools in greater numbers, they joined more clubs, and they received more honors, albeit skewed slightly to a lower level. Indeed, the growth in the number of honors exceeded every other group that had received honors in the mid-century Parliament, and they were receiving honors at practically the same rate as did barristers. All in all, they had become, and seemed to realize that they had become, valued members of society and the political caste. But there was a bifurcation within the ranks of businessmen, with those in banking and finance having attended public schools to a greater extent than many other businessmen, belonging to a different mix of gentlemen's clubs, much closer to the profile of club membership of those in government, the military, and the landed, than the rest of the businessmen, and nearly 72% of those in banking and finance received at least one

honor, a rate between those of government and the military, and far in excess of other professions/income groups or other businessmen.

So what does this information tell us about the arguments between Anderson, Nairn, and Perkin, about the position of businessmen in the British society of the nineteenth century? Were the entrepreneurs supine to the aristocrats? Did they actually run the country, albeit by remote control? Also there has been an ongoing argument about the meaning of the electoral reforms of the early 1830s. Was this a triumph of the middle class? Did it create the middle class? Was the success of the reform of the Corn Law proof of the triumph of middle class ideals? I believe what is found in this study is that the evidence from the first Parliament we reviewed, the one of 1852-1857, twenty and more years after the Great Reform Act of 1832, suggests that businessmen were respected as Members of Parliament, were able to have an impact upon legislation, but with only one businessman in the government, and in a junior position at that, they had not yet 'arrived'. Palmerston's put down when Glyn complained (chapter one, page 7) about the late hours of the House's sittings is a classic example of a noble demanding deference and demonstrated the old belief that those in commerce had to conform to the aristocracy's view of how government was conducted. Businessmen seem to have recognized their junior status and seemingly tried to make up for it by attending the sittings to a greater proportion than others and speaking often. They were not the leaders of the Parliament nor of the government, but they were not supine. They made themselves heard, and seemingly were

respected, especially within their areas of expertise, such as business, taxes and government finance, and trade.

By contrast, in this later Parliament Balfour spent a great deal of time in the Commons discussing the hours of sittings of the House of Commons, and apologizing when the press of business made it necessary to have late sittings. There was by now a standing rule that the Commons would try to wrap up a sitting by midnight, rather than carrying on from late into the night to early in the morning. Four businessmen were in the Cabinet, and Chamberlain was considered one of the most important members of the government. Interestingly, businessmen may well have recognized their change in status for, as best we can tell from their percentage of the votes in the divisions we have been able to study, they seem to have attended the Commons a bit less than their percentage of the membership would indicate that they should. With the exception of one category, their sponsorship of bills was also marginally less than their percentage of membership.

Perkin, in his book, The Origins of Modern English Society, says that few doubted that the ‘capitalist middle class were the real rulers of mid-Victorian England,’⁵ and that this was possible because they had managed to impose their ideal upon the society.⁶ What are the proofs of this? He cites the electoral reform before Victoria’s reign, and the repeal of the Corn Law, as well as the imposition of a middle class morality. But certainly the repeal of the Corn Law was caused as much if not more by the unexpected ‘Black Swan’ event of the Irish Potato Famine, as by agitation of the Anti-Corn Law Leaguers. And it was the Queen who exemplified

middle-class morality, but she was not particularly fond of businessmen. Indeed, the behavior of the businessmen in the Parliament of 1852-1857 in the aftermath of the abolition of the Corn Law, as well as their treatment by the political establishment, would not lead to anyone suggesting that these business Parliamentarians viewed themselves as the rulers of the nation.

Further, while by the end of the Victorian era the businessmen in Parliament seemed much more comfortable in the role of national leaders, with businessmen in the Cabinet, they still did not enjoy the spoils of power, club memberships and honors to the degree of many other Profession/Income groups. The honors they received, for instance, tended to be lesser and come later than those of many other professions. Thus I am not sure that Perkin's idea of imposition of capitalist middle class ideals on the British culture by the middle of the Victorian era is correct. I do believe that what has been found in the study above indicates something which is much more complex. The number of businessmen in the political establishment was growing steadily throughout the last half of the nineteenth century and at an accelerating rate in the last decade and a half of the century. Sometime between 1857 and 1895, the business class was finally able to become fully a part of the Parliamentary political culture and the government. But when exactly? Perhaps the pattern of the rise of business membership in Parliament might give us the answer. The steady rise of the percentage of businessmen in Parliament in the thirty years between 1857 (from over 20%) and 1886 (about 27%) could indicate that such was the time, but I think the increase from 27% business membership in 1886 to over 37% nine years later, with

businessmen now making up the largest proportion of the membership of the House of Commons, suggests that the critical time may well fall within this later nine year period. If so, then the so called 'triumph' of the capitalistic middle class, and their comfort with their position, has to fall later in the nineteenth century, near the end of it.

Thus, I offer this analogy: if the reforms of the early 1830s could be said to represent the crossing of the Rubicon, the Parliament of 1852-1857 would imply the advanced parties of this new army were in the vicinity of Rome, perhaps with a few infiltrating into the city and forum, but the hoards had not yet really broken into the city, and it wasn't until sometime after 1886 that the city was occupied. However, even at this late date, Salisbury and his landed legions were still making a last stand at the Senate House, and the final conquest of this last outpost would not come until the new century.

Chapter Four

The Wiener Thesis of Late 20th Century British Business Failure

The information generated by this study of the last of Victoria's Parliaments can be used as a sample to address one of the more recent and contentious debates which has taken place in British history. In 1981 Cambridge University Press published a relatively short book, 170 pages of text with 39 pages of notes, which nevertheless has become a central text in modern British historiography, Martin Wiener's English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit. Written in part in reaction to the United Kingdom's then current economic troubles, Wiener's basic argument was that although England benefitted greatly from the first industrial revolution which began in the last third of the eighteenth century, as the nineteenth century progressed a reaction set in to oppose, contain, and then tame the aggressive entrepreneurial spirit which underwrote this industrial boom. Consequently, in the period following the great exhibit of 1851, England's economic and industrial lead shrank as other nations, specifically the United States and Germany, perfected new methodologies of production, developed better management techniques, and exploited new technologies and business opportunities.

Approaching this thesis through examples in British culture, Wiener presented numerous examples of literary works critical of industrialization and its side effects, works which lauded England's agrarian past and romantically misremembered the 'happy' state of the peasantry. As an example of this phenomenon, Wiener pointed to

the primacy of the memory of the socialist and cultural historian William Morris over the memory of a man who may have actually benefitted more people, the automotive industrialist William Morris.

Wiener's use of literary quotes has been likened to a thick impasto of quotations: Mill, Arnold, Ruskin, Dickens, Morris, Tennyson, Ford Madox Ford, Thomas Hardy, R. Jefferies, Kipling, Henry Newbolt, Glessing, Watson, Yeats, and on and on. Further, Wiener argued that this reaction to industrialization could also be seen in other cultural manifestations such as the rise of neo-gothic architecture as a reaction to industrially plain architecture, and that this looking back to the past led to the movement toward architectural restoration. The result of this reaction and rediscovery of the past led to a reappraisal of industry, turning it in many minds from something for the good to something troublesome, in the least. He pointed out that while in 1850 Samuel Smiles saw industrialization as a great good, by 1880 Toynbee was questioning whether it was time to reconsider the previous quest for growth to one of fair distribution. According to Wiener: "After Toynbee, the industrial revolution was seen as the spread over a green and pleasant land, of dark satanic mills that ground down their inmates. . ." ¹ Intellectuals piled on. Kipling and C. R. L. Fletcher, and separately G. K. Chesterton, wrote books denigrating industrialization. Belloc saw descent into the abyss, and the Hammonds wrote of the nineteenth century as a century of inequality, excessively production-oriented, and wealth crazed. Tawney, and later Trevelyan, echoed the Hammonds. Wiener even found an anti-

materialist strain among Oxbridge economists Mill, Marshall, Hobson, and even Keynes.

Other cultural centers reinforced this tendency. The Church, led by Inge and Mathews, repudiated the industrial revolution and materialism as un-English.

Between the wars other religious groups: Copec (Conference on Christian Politics, Economics, and Citizenship), Noel's Catholic crusade, League of the Kingdom of God, National Guilds League and the Christendom Group, all opposed unbridled capitalism, or in some cases, capitalism itself. The rise of Labourism was also a reaction to the nineteenth century. Many socialists not only disdained materialism but also longed for the rustic. The rustic, the southern metaphor, associated with the aristocracy, was the *bete noire* of Wiener's piece.

Within this context, posited Wiener, businessmen found their role being degraded and thus sought for themselves or their children the more acceptable role of gentleman. To achieve acceptance in this new role, entrepreneurs would have to adopt a new ideology. This ideology was one of polite landed society - an aristocratic ideal. This ideal was one of interrelationships between the classes, with those better off watching out for their retainers. The pursuit of money was not central as in the entrepreneurial ideal.

Wiener argued that this aristocratic ideal was inculcated into the entrepreneurial class through education - specifically the "public" schools. It began with Thomas Arnold's reforms at Rugby (headmaster 1828-1841), his emphasis on morality, religion, classics, and sport, which became known as muscular Christianity.

This education was not oriented toward practical subjects. As an example, Wiener points out that Rugby didn't teach experimental science until 1859, and then not on campus but rather in public space nearby. Experimental science wasn't acceptable because it was too practical and not aristocratic.

Within a few years many of the leading "public" schools were following Rugby's lead. As businessmen achieved economic success, they sent their sons to the best schools these sons could get into and that the fathers could afford, but in some ways this did not matter, since much of the ideals and curriculum of the leading public schools had been imposed on the whole of the English secondary education system through the public schools dominance of the Headmasters' Conference. The result was that the entrepreneurial ideal of tough decision making, innovation, and self-sacrifice, was replaced with fair play and morality. And businessmen became acceptable in society.

This could be seen when, in the early twentieth century, the Conservative (or Tory) party, traditionally land oriented, had accepted businessmen into their ranks, and became the party of property, business as well as land. Yet the Conservatives still retained their rustic spirit. As proof, Wiener cites Chamberlain's failure to capture control of the party with his program of tariff reform. Chamberlain had recognized that Britain's economic position required significant changes in policy, but the Conservatives, especially the Cecils, saw the changes as too materialistic in spirit.² Later Baldwin, in spite of being heir to an ironworks business, bought land, entered politics, and became Prime Minister, utilizing the image not of businessman

Baldwin, but of Farmer Stan. In rhetoric and program he "harked back to times of gentler industrial and human relations."³ Indeed, by 1935, in the wake of the postwar depression, Baldwin declared *laissez-faire* dead.

Thus, Wiener argued, England had declined economically because the businessmen of the late nineteenth century had succumbed to the attacks upon them, had deferred to the aristocratic ideal, and by sending their sons to public schools, had failed in their duty to guarantee the future material success of the nation.

The result, according to Wiener, was the extinction of the entrepreneurial drive of the business class and the loss of British technological advantage, which led to the decline of British industrial competitiveness. All in all, from the standpoint of the British economy, very grim.

Wiener was not the only one to advance such arguments. In many ways his argument was an elaboration of previous arguments put forward by David Ward in his article 'The Public Schools and Industry in Britain after 1870'⁴ and D. C. Coleman in his article "Gentlemen and Players"⁵ But in turn both had been preceded by D. H. Aldcroft's article "The Entrepreneur and the British Economy, 1840-1914," which blamed the entrepreneurs (and suggested public school education may have been a contributing factor) for much of the failure of British business to develop technological and business practices after the great success of the initial industrial revolution. He cited steel as an example. Aldcroft, however, was a bit more balanced in his approach, admitting that social and cultural factors, trade

patterns, and relative size of the home market, all may have had some impact on the relative decline of Britain's economy in the late nineteenth century.⁶

Ward argued that education, especially in boarding school, could be as influential as family in the transmission of culture. The great growth in the size of the ancient public schools and the creation of new ones, notably Cheltenham, Marlborough, Rossal, Radley, Epsom, Clifton, and Haileybury's refoundation, and especially the foundation of Wellington, all after 1840, were cited. According to Ward, they shared the same fundamental characteristics: a classics dominated curriculum; after 1880, 'manliness'; and the effect of the school's chapel. In tracing the life stories of the head boys of many of the public schools, he found few going into business, and depending upon the particular school, many into military or imperial service or education and some into law and the clergy.

Coleman, in his article, argued that the most important members of society for industrialization were those who were just below the line dividing those who were gentlemen and the rest of society. These 'yeomen, traders, skilled artisans,'⁷ successful farmers, etc. were the 'practical' men who were willing to engage in tinkering and manual labour, (an activity that gentlemen and above did not do) which created and sustained the industrialization of the nation. As their utility and contribution to the country rose, 'the acknowledged virtue of the practical man grew greater.'⁸ In time they would naturally seek to become a gentleman themselves or have their children or grandchildren rise into the ranks of the gentlemen.

Further, according to Coleman, most of these practical men probably did not see the innovation which they had come up with as ‘the beginning of an era in which invention and innovation were to be built into the whole process of business life.’⁹ Thus sending their family members to available public schools would not necessarily be seen as something bad, indeed according to Coleman, after the mid-century it became a flood.

He also wondered if the previous limitation of the effect of the public school on the development of British business management should be limited to the late Victorian, Edwardian, and pre World War era. Why, he wondered, couldn’t it be extended to include the inter-war years and more modern era?

Another historian, Correlli Barnett in his study of the Second World War, Audit of War,¹⁰ laid much of the blame for the weakness of the British economy heading into World War II on Britain's failure to exploit the second industrial revolution at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries. He seemed to agree with and accept Wiener's argument about the impact of Arnoldian philosophy on the whole of British education. However, unlike Wiener, he placed the blame for post-war British economic failure not on unsuitably educated scions of entrepreneurs, but rather on the reluctance of British industry to sufficiently modernize after the First World War; and on the British wartime government of the Second World War for failure to recognize the gross shortcomings in their industrial base and failure to plan for industrial modernization following the war. Instead Britain chose to develop a national cradle to grave welfare state called ‘New

Jerusalem.’ Housing, nursery care, pre- and elementary schools, and national health were to be privileged over reindustrialization and higher technical education. It is in this choice that Barnett lays the blame for Britain's economic failure post 1950.

Needless to say there have been those who have argued against both the education - based argument of Wiener and even against the idea that the United Kingdom did so abominably poorly economically. In answer to a point that Aldcroft had made, Peter Temin, an economist at MIT, rejected the idea that entrepreneurial failure was a root cause of the failure of the British steel industry. He argued that Britain’s early development of steel making locked it into earlier, less efficient manufacturing processes than those of the later developing countries, especially Germany and the United States. Because Great Britain was a smaller market than either of the other two, especially the United States, there was no internal driver to push the national industry toward more efficient manufacturing, and thus Britain’s relative decline was not the fault of the sons of entrepreneurs but the result of factors beyond their control.¹¹ Hartmut Berghoff argued that since only 18% of entrepreneurs in Birmingham, Bristol and Manchester, had attended public schools, the influence of the elite institutions was limited. And Berghoff also analyzed the Dictionary of Business Biography – a source we will use - and found that fewer than 21% of the entrants had attended these schools.¹²

W. D. Rubinstein was perhaps the most vocal in his opposition to Wiener et al. His argument was that the heavy industrial phase of Great Britain's history was merely a passing phase, that the real strength of Britain's economy was, and is still,

services such as finance, insurance, and shipping. By studying, in detail, tax returns and biographies of businessmen, he believed he has most clearly defined the changes over the late eighteenth and nineteenth century in the economic base of the United Kingdom. He summed up his argument with a simple graph, the geographical location from where business and professional income tax returns were filed. London always led, though it fell from forty percent (nearly fifty percent if 'London' is expanded to include the home counties) in 1806 to approximately twenty - seven percent (thirty - three percent with home counties) at about 1851 and then started to trend up to about forty - three percent (over forty - five) by the end of the century and even higher by the time of the First World War. On the other hand, returns from Lancashire and Yorkshire rose, fitfully, from about twelve percent in 1806 to a high of approximately twenty - four percent in 1860 and then trailed off towards twenty percent at the end of the century, sliding down even a little more by the war.

Rubinstein argued that this is a metaphor for the relative importance of London based commerce and finance over northern based industry. Of course, there was the development of an extensive rail network, able to whisk people around the country relatively quickly thus potentially allowing some industrialists to live in town homes in London, and the fact that London was home to some industry, while, on the other hand, there was an extensive country banking system, might indicate that the geographical dispersion of these tax returns was not a perfect metaphor.

Nevertheless, the sheer scale of the preponderance of the home counties advantage does argue that Rubinstein was on to something.¹³

Robert Millward in his chapter 'Industry and Infrastructure' in The British Industrial Decline, neatly sums up the results of much of other recent research which emphasises the broad nature of the problem as it is currently conceived:

‘Britain’s craft-based production methods, its urbanization problem, its overseas trading dimension confronted policy-makers with both economic and social problems. In a narrow economic sense, the industrial inheritance generated three problems. The massive decline in Britain's share of world exports in the twentieth century can be traced in part to the overseas focus of early industrialization which made Britain vulnerable to the rise of new industrializing countries. At the same time, the craft - based nature of production meant, as Broadberry emphasized, that it could not take advantage of technological advance occurring in mass production capital intensive methods. Thirdly, the entrenched labour intensive methods of production which had proved so successful over the nineteenth century rendered labour much less mobile than in the USA. These three economic issues are enough to account for Britain's relative decline and one associated with a substantial regional problem. They amount to a massive problem of adjustments which would have challenged any country, any culture, any educational system.’¹⁴

Wiener’s argument is on the macro level, and has been answered in such manner by many of those above. The problem is that one cannot fully answer the issue raised by Wiener this way. Wiener really does not give any substantial proof that the sons of British entrepreneurs taught in Arnoldian influenced schools proved to be incapable of managing their family’s businesses. They very well might have been capable, and successful too. All we have from him is a description of Arnoldian

education, its content, its context, and an assertion that it ruined the entrepreneurial drive of its students. Further, how can one say definitely that this particular cause or another led to the demise of an industry or of a firm? Business failure is not usually caused by one factor. We cannot look at all businesses in England at any particular date, the sheer numbers would overwhelm, and if one was to look at a few industries or firms, how would those companies be chosen? And how many? Sheer volume might overwhelm. Any collection of biographical sketches of business leaders chosen by an historian would be subject to questions as to whether the subjects were fairly representative.

Wiener states that by the end of the Victorian era the pattern was set. Thus, since the study of our second Parliament is also a study of the last of Victoria's Parliaments, it gives us an opportunity to create a sample of late Victorian businesses. Further, it is a blindly chosen sample because the subjects are partly self chosen, since they chose to run for office, partly chosen by the electorate, since they had won a seat in Victoria's last Parliament, and, by using the Dictionary of Business Biography, partly chosen by other historians of business. This triple screen takes the choice out of my perhaps prejudiced hands and leaves us with sixty-six business MPs who served in this last Parliament.

We have already discussed the educational background of the MPs in the Parliament of 1895-1900, as well as proxies for their social position, their club memberships and honors received, but a review will be useful. The educational background for the members of these Parliaments has been found by looking at their

Dod's entry, or if not found there, in their entry in the Dictionary of National Biography, the Dictionary of Irish Biography, the Dictionary of Business Biography, or finally, Burke's Peerage and Baronetage, if they have an entry in one of these other sources. Our earlier Parliament, the one of 1852-1857, is largely irrelevant to Wiener's argument since few of the parliamentarians would have attended the public schools which are a main target of Wiener's attack, since he has a self imposed beginning date of 1850. Further, of the one hundred sixty business members plus the seventeen company directors of this earlier Parliament, only thirty four (or nineteen percent) had attended public schools, and at that, only 15 percent had attended one of the five most prestigious, Eton, Harrow, Winchester, Westminster, or Rugby.

However, by this later Parliament, most businessmen had primary and secondary schooling. Table 91 shows the breakdown of public school attendance as follows:

Table 91
Secondary Education of Parliamentarians in the Parliament
Of 1895-1900 by Percentages

Profession	Clarendon Schools	Other Public Schools	Other	Unknown
Government Service	69.4	8.0	8.0	15.6
Land Ownership	67.1	4.3	12.9	15.7
Military	52.2	13.0	14.5	20.3
Education	33.3	25.0	33.3	8.4
Barrister	31.5	12.7	41.2	14.5
Writer/journalist	29.4	11.8	29.4	29.4
Other	20.6	11.8	41.2	26.5
Business	19.4	10.1	49.7	19.8
Solicitor	9.0	9.0	73.0	9.0
M. D.	8.0	8.0	54.0	32.0
Labour	0	0	64.7	35.3

[Sources: Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900, The Dictionary of National Biography, Boase's Modern English Biography, Boylan's Dictionary of Irish Biography, the British Biographical Archive: Seventeenth through the Nineteenth Centuries, and the Dictionary of Business Biography.]

As we have seen before, the Clarendon schools (Eton, Harrow, Winchester, Westminster, Rugby, Charterhouse, St. Pauls, Shrewsbury, and Merchant Tailor) dominated the education of the classifications which contain those who have been traditionally the political and governmental leaders of Britain, government service, landed interests, and the military. Those who used words: educators, writers and journalists, and barristers are also often graduates of Clarendon or other public schools. Next, in the hierarchy of Clarendon school attendees comes the catch all of ‘other’ and then business, followed distantly by solicitors and MDs. No labour representatives attended public schools.

For business we will break down the classification in greater detail in Table 92:

Table 92
Secondary Education of Business Parliamentarians
in the Parliament of 1895-1900
by percentage

Occupation	Clarendon Schools	Other Public Schools	Other Schools	Unknown
Banker	45.0	17.5	20.0	17.5
Insurance	-	-	100	-
Other Finance	23.5	17.6	41.2	17.6
Shipping	4.2	4.2	70.8	20.8
Railways	27.6	6.9	37.9	27.6
Cotton	5.3	10.5	57.9	26.3
Wool/Linen	9.1	9.1	54.5	27.3
Merchant	10.4	29.2	18.8	41.6
Steel/Iron	4.3	17.5	56.5	21.7
Construction	-	12.5	37.5	50.0
Marine Eng.	11.1	33.3	55.5	-
Telecom	50.0	-	50.0	-
Utility	-	-	50.0	-
Brewer	56.3	-	31.2	12.5
Distiller	40.0	20.0	40.0	-
Colliery	25.0	16.7	50.0	8.3
Pub./Printer	22.2	-	66.7	11.1
Other	1.8	3.6	45.5	49.1

[Source: Dod’s Parliamentary Companion, 1895-1900.]

As one can discern from the Table 92 above, it is in the 'old' businesses such as banking, other finance, brewing, distilling, that the percentage of public school attendees begins to approach that of government leaders, the landed, and those who fight. Bankers, at a combined 62.5%, fall comfortably near military in the earlier table, distillers and brewers are close behind, and other financial and merchants are just behind barristers. Those who are classified as being involved in telecommunications, collieries, and in railways are the only others who come close to the upper half of the previous list (although telecommunications has only four in this class and thus this percentage is unreliable).

Amongst the bankers, Eton graduates were twenty percent of the count, Harrow, over seventeen, Rugby, Winchester, and Charterhouse with about three percent each, other schools included Tottenham and Cheltenham. Other finance had nearly nineteen percent from Eton, six from Rugby, with Edinburgh Academy, City of London School and Royal Liverpool also represented. Westminster and Harrow and Wimbledon each had twenty percent of the distillers, while Eton had over thirty-one percent of the brewers, followed by Harrow at nineteen percent and Winchester at six percent. Eton led among those involved in rails with nearly sixteen percent, Harrow at only three, while Rugby was at seven percent. Over four percent of merchants (mainly foreign merchants) had attended either Eton or Harrow, over two percent Rugby, with the rest scattered among Tottenham, Irish preparatory, and other grammar schools. Eton had no competitors from Harrow among steelmen. Rugby solely educated those in cotton, wool/linen, and printing or publishing.

Of course, these categories, bankers, other finance, distillers, and brewers and, real estate (since it can be argued that, in England, this often is an aristocratic income producing activity) are those old activities that Rubinstein credits as being far more important than northern industry. The one he includes which in our sample does not show a high percentage of public school boys is shipping. This may be the result of the incredibly rapid growth of shipping in the mid to late nineteenth century based upon the new iron and steel steamers. England excelled in this industry which was strongly supported by northern industrialists because of their iron and steel interests. We have also seen the acceptance of businessmen in the higher reaches of political society by their participation in government office, their memberships in non-political clubs, and their receipt of honors. And we have seen that businessmen in banking and finance were more likely than other businessmen to belong to upper level social clubs, indicating the previous noted dichotomy within the ranks of business, and they received honors at a rate that fell mid way between those who were in government and the military.

While these results are more supportive of Rubinstein's argument rather than Wiener's, they only really tell us about those who had achieved much at the end of the nineteenth century. Nevertheless, Wiener blamed them, in part, for the subsequent economic travails of England. Can we push this study forward in time to learn more?

What we will attempt to do here is to look for evidence among the members of this particular Parliament to see if what we find supports Wiener's contention that public school education helped lead to the economic decline of England as the sons of

the entrepreneurs turn away from commerce, or if we find other causes for declines, such as technological changes, secular changes, and so forth. We will look to see if we can find examples of public school educated sons successfully leading their family companies through difficult circumstances. Our evidence is limited, it would be difficult to do a comprehensive study of end-of-the-Victorian-era businesses up to the present day to ascertain this information, but the analysis of this latter Parliament has given us the opportunity to have a somewhat random sample. I do not believe the result of this review will be definitive concerning Wiener's thesis, rather I believe the results would best be described as highly suggestive.

Of the 287 identified full-time businessmen in the last Parliament of Victoria's reign, the Dictionary of Business Biography has listings for sixty-six (approximately twenty-three percent of the 287) of the members themselves or members of their families. The individual firms that these MPs were involved with can be traced past the end of the nineteenth century, in many cases up to the present. To make it easier to follow who of those listed below was in our Parliament, those in the firms below who were in the Parliament of 1895-1900 are italicized. These sixty-six can be divided by industry: fourteen in banking, finance, or stock brokerage; seven in collieries, iron, and steel; seven shipbuilders; eight in textiles; five ship owners; three chemists; three in brewing, distilling, or tobacco (the 'sinful' products); three in metal products or hardware; two in retail; two contract builders; two food manufacturers; two in paper or ink; one each in glass, stationary engine manufacturing, railways, submarine cables, news publication, leather, accounting, and pottery.

Of the fourteen in banking, finance, stock brokerage, ten were personally in the Parliament, and the other four, Rupert Evelyn Beckett, Henry Hucks Gibbs, Charles Morrison, and Joseph H. Tritton were father or brothers of MPs. Six of our ten MPs attended public schools: *Bolitho* and *Martin* at Harrow, *Lubbock* at Eton, *Banbury* at Winchester, and *Philipps* at Felsted; the remaining, *Begg*, *Henderson*, *Montague*, and *Rothschild* were privately educated. Three of the other four attended public schools, bringing the total to nine of fourteen or 64.4% of those in finance being attendees of the public schools.

Banbury, *Begg*, and *Henderson* were stockbrokers. *Frederick George Banbury*, a member of the London Stock Exchange from 1872 became head of his father's firm in 1878, and ran it until 1906 when he dissolved the firm, having lost a battle with *F. F. Begg* (see below) concerning the management of the Exchange. However, he was not at loose ends, serving as a director of the London and Provincial Bank, director, and later chairman of Colonial Securities Trust, director of the Great Northern Railway from 1903 and chairman of it after 1917. He lost his son in action in 1914 and was survived by his daughter.¹⁵

From age 25, *F. Faithful Begg* had been a stockbroker, first in Edinburgh, and then at the age of 39 moving to London. Besides beating *Banbury* in the internal Exchange battle in 1906, he was involved in Australian banking and gold field ventures. His son, Francis Cargill Begg followed him as a broker on the Exchange.¹⁶

Alexander Henderson, son of a scholar, first worked at Deloitte, which specialized in railway accounting. Within a few years he became a member of the

London Stock Exchange and joined Thomas Greenwood specializing in major financing. During the course of this Parliament, his expertise resulted in his being able to take the Manchester, Sheffield and Lincolnshire Railway, deeply in debt after mismanagement, refinancing the company through innovative use of rolling stock bonds, turning it into the successful Great Central Railway and becoming chairman of it in 1899. He also was active in finance, other railroads, ironworking, and publishing in the UK and had other interests in South America, Africa, and Asia. He left over £ 1,000,000 at his death, which descended to his grandson, a politician.¹⁷

There were three traditional deposit and loan bankers listed in the Dictionary of Business Biography who were in this Parliament: *Thomas Bedford Bolitho* of Bolitho's Bank in Mounts Bay,¹⁸ *John Lubbock* of Lubbock, Foster and Company (later Roberts, Lubbock and Company),¹⁹ and *Sir Richard Biddulph Martin* of Martin's Bank, sign of the grasshopper, Lombard Street.²⁰ In addition, the Dictionary lists Rupert E. Beckett,²¹ younger brother of *Ernest William Beckett*, MP, both of whom were members of Beckett and Company, bankers at Leeds, through whom we can follow the evolution of Beckett Bank. As we have noted above, *Lubbock* attended Eton and *Bolitho* and *Martin* attended Harrow. *Beckett* was also an Etonian, going on to Cambridge, while only *Martin* of those listed above attended a university, Oxford.

Joseph Herbert Tritton is listed in the Dictionary.²² He and his brother, *Charles Ernest Tritton*, MP, were great-grandsons of John Henton Tritton who had joined a Lombard Street banking firm which subsequently became known as Barclay,

Bevan, and Tritton, Ransom Bouverie and Company. In 1896 this was the lead firm in the twenty member amalgamation which became Barclays Bank. Both *Tritton* brothers had attended Rugby with Joseph Herbert directly joining the bank and *Charles Ernest* matriculating to Trinity Hall, Cambridge and subsequently working at Brightman and Company, bill brokers.

Bolitho's bank merged into Barclays on 1905, and Martin's bank, after merging with the Bank of Liverpool in 1918 and subsequently absorbing a few other banks, merged with Barclays in 1969.²³ Lubbock's bank was acquired by Coutts to gain a branch and access to the London Clearing House (their clientele being very similar: wealthy, often landed), and Coutts was then acquired by National Provincial (while maintaining a separate name, board, and management). National Provincial subsequently merged with the District bank, then Westminster Bank, creating NatWest, which, in turn, in the last decade, was purchased by Royal Bank of Scotland.²⁴ Beckett's bank is also part of the RBS stable, having been acquired by Westminster bank in 1921. Westminster itself previously had merged with the London County Bank before the First World War and had just consummated a merger with Parrs bank in the late nineteen - teens.

What this shows is that traditional banking, an ancient business traceable back into the middle ages in England (the Templars and the Lombards then and, indeed, some of the above mentioned banks themselves can be traced into the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries), in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century responded to the Barings crisis and possibly to international competition by merging

amongst themselves. While the individual independent companies disappeared, the assets continued on.

Some members of this Parliament were innovators in finance. *Henderson* has been mentioned, but one of the most famous and an early innovator in finance was Rothschilds which had been founded in London in 1805 as a separate branch of the family's banking group based in Frankfurt. While highly successful in the last third of the eighteenth century and in the period following its establishment in London; after 1836 when Nathan Meyer, the founder of the London branch died, the company's experience was uneven. Gains on bullion trade and loans to Brazil and on commercial credit in continental Europe offset losses on Confederate bonds. South African investments, specifically Wernher Beit and Company and De Beers were great successes as was helping to arrange the government's purchase of the Khedive of Egypt's share in the Suez Canal.²⁵

Samuel Montague and Company, which began with £ 5,000 capital in 1852, evolved from being a foreign exchange house, to bullion operations, to discounting foreign bills which resulted in the company underwriting foreign loan flotations. By the end of the century it was considered to be second only to Rothschilds in its capital base and importance.²⁶

While Rothschilds had been built upon great success at the end of the eighteenth century and the first third of the nineteenth, and Samuel Montague thrived in the second half of the nineteenth century, Antony Gibbs and Sons emerged in the middle third of the nineteenth century as one of the most profitable firms of the time.

Henry Hucks Gibbs, father of two of our parliamentarians, *Alban George Henry Gibbs* (1846-1936) and *Vicary Gibbs* (1853-1932), joined the family firm just after it had secured the monopoly in loaning on, and trading in, Peruvian guano - a fertilizer (note: Resulting in the delightful little ditty: "The house of Gibbs, who made their dibs, by selling the turds, of foreign birds.") Profits grew from £17,156 in 1848 to more than £125,000 in 1858 and averaged over £137,000 for the next five years until the Peruvian government, in a fit of nationalist sentiment, allotted the trade only to native firms. Gibbs suffered four years of losses but recovered with profits growing to over £27,000 per year average in the 1875-1879 period. Henry H. Gibbs had succeeded his uncle as head of the firm in 1875 and had led the evolution of the firm into banking, merchant banking, and insurance brokerage. H. H. Gibbs had attended Rugby in the 1830s (when Arnold was headmaster) and Oxford (BA and MA) and his sons both attended Eton and Oxford.²⁷

Samuel Montague and Company was bought in stages (1967-1974) by Midland Bank.²⁸ Rothschilds has closely aligned with its sister firm in Paris, and Antony Gibbs continued as an independent merchant bank and then insurance broker in the City until it was swallowed by the Hong Kong and Shanghai Banking Corporation in 1980. If one goes to the HSBC insurance web site, Antony Gibbs is prominently featured as the basis for HSBC's insurance brokerage operation.²⁹

One of the most successful financiers of the Victorian and Edwardian eras was Charles Morrison, brother of *Walter Morrison*, the MP for Yorkshire - Skipton in our Parliament. Their father, James Morrison, grew up in a middling rural household and

became manager of the London warehouse of Messrs. Todd and Company, his eventual father-in-law's business. By 1818 he controlled the business and within twenty years had diversified his business interests and had been elected an MP and chosen a JP. His oldest son Charles, unlike his brothers who went to Eton, was privately educated in London and Geneva, then attended the University of Edinburgh followed by Trinity College, Cambridge.

In the 1840's Charles joined his brother, Alfred, and their father in a new firm, Morrison, Sons and Company 'which took over management of the varied investments outside the Fore Street warehouse... ' Mortgage, merchant banking, and railway development were this company's pursuits over the next fifteen years. When James Morrison died in 1857 the brothers divided the assets, Charles continuing to invest in his own name, Alfred retiring to the country, and *Walter* serving in Parliament. Over the next fifty years Charles quietly invested in and managed a host of companies (probably occasionally with the aforementioned *Alexander Henderson*), sitting on the boards of some of the companies he was involved with including the Netherlands Land Enclosure Company; Swedish Central Railway Company; Trust and Loan Company of Canada, Hounslow and Metropolitan Railway Company; North British Land and Mercantile Insurance Company; and investing heavily in the Mercantile Bank of the River Plate and its successor, River Plate Trust, Loan, and Agency company, and its subsequent successors and assigns. When he died in 1909 his estate was in excess of the enormous sum of £10,900,000 gross.

Charles wrote in 1842 that he had concluded that the only way to make and maintain wealth was to pay constant attention to it: attend to the office, keep track of one's financial affairs, join boards of companies in which one had invested. Constant diligence was required and Charles chose to live his life accordingly, living frugally, devoted to business, never marrying.³⁰

Another brilliant financier of the time was *John Wynford Philipps*. He was the oldest of the eleven children of Canon Sir James Erasmus Philipps, 12th Baronet. After the family's baronetage and land were separated the family had become impoverished gentry often serving in the church. Four of Sir James' sons are listed in the Dictionary of Business Biography, *John Wynford*, Ivor, Laurence, and Owen. *John Wynford*, the only one who was an MP in this Parliament, although two of the other three would subsequently serve, attended Falsted (as did his brothers) and Oxford, going on to qualify as a barrister in the Middle Temple. He married an heiress and subsequently joined the board of an investment trust named Government Stocks and Other Securities Investment Company. Within a year he became chairman as he successfully led the trust through the turmoil suffered in the Baring crisis. He later took control of or started other trusts as well. Through these investment trusts he held large stakes in or started, and with the help of his brothers, managed, such companies as King Line; Royal Mail Shipping; Associated Portland Cement; British Electric Traction; Ilfords; Court Line; Schweppes; Kia-Ora, Ltd; Haldin and Company; British East Africa Corporation; Harland and Wolff; Colvilles; Thomas Hedley; and International Merchant Marine. The activities of the Philipps

groups obviously were quite extensive and diverse, including many 'new' industries such as portland cement, beverages, and electrical equipment.³¹

In summary, at least in this sample, the financiers in this Parliament, or who have family in this Parliament, and are listed in the Dictionary of Business Biography, can be divided into two broad categories. Those whose businesses, usually banks, had come to them after several generations, generally had attended public schools and were able to maintain their family's assets in a changing market by consolidation. The other comes into finance, perhaps through a father, sometimes on one's own, usually without a public school education, and succeeds by finding profitable niches, such as stockbrokerage, or the new vehicle of investment trusts. While Charles Morrison's non-attendance at public schools (as opposed to his brother's) would seem to support the position that public school education spoiled the sons of entrepreneurs, all of the Philipps attended a public school, came from a gentrified family, but nevertheless were very active and successful in business, and, in the case of the eldest, extremely successful. Note that both Morrison and Philipps often worked with their respective family members. In this sample, coming from banking, scholarly, country, or even impoverished gentry background, there is no cohesive entrepreneurial class discernible here to explain these entrepreneurs' origins, nor does education alone seem to explain their outcomes.

The next largest group of businessmen found in the Dictionary of Business Biography is in the colliery, iron, and steel category. Here seven of our end-of-the-century MPs are found: *Alfred Baldwin, Henry Blundell Hollinshead Blundell, Sir*

James Heath, Sir Alfred Hickman, James Joicey, Joseph A. Pease, and D. A. Thomas. Blundell attended Eton and Oxford, *Heath and Thomas* attended Clifton with *Heath* heading directly into his family's firm and *Thomas* attending Cambridge before entering business. *Pease* was educated at Tottenham and Cambridge, *Hickman* at King Edward VI school at Birmingham and *Joicey* at Gainford but neither attended university, nor had *Baldwin* whose education is listed as 'private'. Thus four out of seven attended public schools, one at Eton, one at Tottenham, two at Clifton.

Corelli Barnett in his book previously mentioned, Audit of War, succinctly explains the basic problems of the coal, iron, and steel industries in Great Britain. The coal industry developed in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries in a piecemeal fashion as aggressive capitalists opened coal seams to supply a growing need in iron and later steel, heating, and especially for steam engines. It was a labor intensive business, under difficult, dirty, and dangerous conditions. Labor for the mines was provided by those being driven off the land. Labor was therefore cheap, replaceable, and expendable. Under these circumstances the miners, who found themselves constantly at odds with the owners, united in common cause, almost tribally according to Barnett, to oppose ownership. Barnett likened the condition of the miners to that of coolies. Ownership, up through the First World War, because of rising worldwide demand for coal which increased sales and profit with little additional investment other than the current cost of additional backs to break doing the picking and shoveling, saw no reason to modernize, consolidate, or restructure the industry. Consequently production was inefficient and could be insufficient,

especially if interrupted by strikes or lack of workers caused by war work and soldiering. The downturn between the wars reinforced the reluctance to modernize so that, during the Second World War (Barnett's touchstone), British energy production, over-whelmingly based on coal, was far short of American or German standards.

The three MPs directly involved with the colliery trade, however, do not necessarily reflect Barnett's characterization of coal mines owners. *Henry Blundell*, 1831-1906, was an improving owner. Jointly inheriting the family collieries with his younger brothers upon his father's death in 1853, *Henry*, a graduate of Eton, who was about to attend Sandhurst (having already received a BA from Oxford's Christ Church), hired William Armstrong of Newcastle to advise him. Following Armstrong's advice, the then general manager and his assistants (and sons) were fired, three of the four collieries were closed or disposed of, and the remaining colliery, Pemberton, was expanded. Within a decade and a half two deep pits were organized and supplied with the most up to date equipment and forty-five million tons of workable coal were added to his estate. Production at the rate of half-a-million tons a year was reached, employing 1800 men. In the 1870s Blundell built Highfield Colliery Village containing miner's houses each with privies, gardens, and a pigsty, as well as a church and school. In times of tragedy he was willing to supplement compensation received from the Miner's Relief Fund.³²

James Joicey's (1846-1936) father was an engineer but his uncle had founded the coal firm of Joicey and Company. Following his education at the Gainford School in West Darlington and time spent as a clerk, *James* went to work for his

uncle's firm and upon his uncle's death took control in 1881. He purchased additional collieries including those of the Earl of Durham, the Marquis of Londonderry, and the Hettan collieries. After consolidation, according to the Dictionary, he was probably the only colliery owner in the world who produced more than six million tons of coal a year. Looking far ahead, in 1952 the firm, still headed by a Joicey, was nationalized for more than £1,000,000.³³

David Alfred Thomas, along with his brother, succeeded his father in controlling his family's collieries while pursuing a political career. He viewed coal as a commodity and therefore believed that the interests of the miners and the owners were for the most part parallel. During this Parliament he published 'For the Prevention of undue Competition and for Maintaining Prices at a Remunerative Level' (1896) which argued for coordination of output and marketing. After a couple of decades in Parliament, failure to achieve office led him to turn his full attention to business and in short order, starting with his return to the Cambrian Colliery Board of Directors, he began acquiring interests in other Welsh collieries (Welsh coal having a high caloric content was preferred for raising steam), and coordinating mining and marketing of his collection of mines. He was a consolidator. By 1910 he was producing three million tons annually and added another three and a half million per year before his death in 1918. The war reignited his political career, Lloyd George sent him to America to expedite the supply of munitions, he then assumed the Presidency of the Local Governing Board and finally became Minister of Food Control. He died, having been entitled Viscount Rhondda, in July of 1918.³⁴

Concerning the iron and steel industries, Barnett complained that the companies did not modernize their plant regularly enough and that the English steel plants were too small and too numerous, although he did admit that this geographic dispersion was an advantage during the Second World War when much of the United Kingdom was within range of the Luftwaffe. Three of our MPs in the iron and steel trade, *Hickman*, *Heath*, and *Pease*, also had collieries as part of the integrated business model. *Hickman* had descended from families on both sides who were involved in iron and coal trades. Educated at King Edward's School, Birmingham, after his father's death, he and his brothers divided their business interests and he proceeded on his own account to become the Black Country's largest pig-iron maker. The introduction of the Bessemer process led him to organize a steelworks. In 1897 he consolidated his interests in steel, coal, and ironstone into Alfred Hickman, Ltd. Contrary to the impression left by both Wiener and Barnett, the English were not always blind to scientific research. *Hickman* established chemical and metallurgical laboratories, sold residual slag as fertilizer, and backed the development of tar macadam, which led to Tarmac, Ltd. (which still exists) and in which his family continued to be involved through at least the 1940s.³⁵

The Heath mining and iron interests grew from a series of investments by Robert Heath II who had learned the colliery business from his father who had been manager of William Kinnersley's collieries at Kids Grove. Between 1855 and 1873 he built up a collection of twenty-eight coal or ironstone pits, eight blast furnaces, 154 puddling/ball furnaces, nine banks furnaces, fourteen mills, and thirty-three heating

furnaces. By 1892 Heath's was the largest ironworks in Staffordshire. His second son, *Sir James* (who was in our Parliament) joined the family firm after education at Clifton. Following his father's death he did well becoming 'the largest producer of bar iron in the world in 1912.' After the war, Heath's company consolidated with the Low Moor Ironworks. Unfortunately, during the inter-war period, poor economic performance, unsuccessful expansion, and exhaustion of company ironstone quarries led to the demise of the firm in the late 1920s.³⁶

Pease Partners, which was an amalgamation of various mining and metallurgical interests of the Pease family, was formed in 1892 and became a public company in 1898. Arising from a woolen manufacturer (Edward Pease, 1767-1858), the family had prospered by being major backers of the Stockton and Darlington Railway in the 1820s and diversifying into coal, ironstone mining, iron making and locomotive building. They founded the port of Middlesbrough. Six Peases, father, sons, and cousins were in this Parliament. *Joseph Albert Pease*, one of the cousins and son of *J. W. Pease* (Friends School – York), also an MP, was a partner with his father and a brother in J. and J. W. Pease Banking, director of Pease and Partners, and would, in time, assume Cabinet positions as Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, President of the Board of Education, and Postmaster General. However, before all of this, but after our Parliament, he, his father and brother had the little problem of the effective bankruptcy of their bank. His father had mis-invested funds and the company was brought to the brink by an unhappy client. With the help of family and friends, by the pledging of personal assets, and the merger of the remainder of the

bank, true bankruptcy was avoided. As *Joseph Albert* had not been the decision maker at the bank, but rather was a partner in name only and therefore had little responsibility for the bank's troubles, he was able to survive the embarrassment, though he had to resign from the board of Pease Partners (to which he was able to return after a few years).

After his political career (and elevation to the peerage), he was a leading advocate for the Mining Association of Great Britain before the Stanley Commission, and amongst the association members advocated cartelization as well as export coordination. Although he was not able to achieve his objective in the short run, by 1930, in the Coal Mines Act, the government advanced proposals for the coordinated marketing of coal, and in 1938, responding in part to his agitation beginning in 1934, mineral royalties were nationalized. In 1922, he became Chairman of the British Broadcasting Company and in 1926 Vice-Chairman of the incorporated BBC. In 1927 he was elected to Chairman of Pease Partners upon the death of a cousin. Additional offices included President of the Radio Manufacturers Association, President of the Federation of British Industries, Chairman of the National Confederation of Employers Organization, Deputy Chairman of the Durham Coalowners Association, Vice-Chairman of the Durham Coke Owners Association, Chairman of the South London Electricity Supply Company, Chairman of Cast Steel Foundry, Ltd. Chairman of the Tees Fishery Board, and Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Bowes Museum.³⁷

Alfred Baldwin (1841-1908) father of future Prime Minister, Stanley Baldwin, was also a builder and consolidator in the steel industry. He joined the family firm in 1850 and over the next sixty years acquired, consolidated, and extended his iron and steel interests until, with the formation of Baldwins, Ltd., had created the largest British steel firm. Additionally, he was Chairman of the Metropolitan Bank of Manchester and succeeded Lord Cawdor as Chairman of the Great Western Railway.³⁸

While most of the minerowners, colliers, and steel men mentioned so far might be considered progressive in outlook, George Shalto Gordon Douglas-Pennant, father of *Edward Shalto Douglas-Pennant*, MP from Northamptonshire, South, (and Eton graduate) would not.³⁹ George Douglas-Pennant's father ran the family slate quarries at Penrhyn. While the quarry company provided cottages, hospitals, and so forth, the cash pay was low, rarely exceeding £ 1 per week. And worse, during the downturn in building during the 1880s, wages were lowered even further, and, after George Douglas-Pennant succeeded his father in 1886, one of the first actions he took was to terminate the Pennant-Lloyd agreement of 1874. This led the miners to hold a mass meeting, which resulted in a lockout at a neighboring quarry which lasted six months. 'In 1886, however, Lord Penrhyn tried to present himself as a kindly father figure to his workmen, offering to pay half the cost of their excursion tickets to London. The men expressed their gratitude.'⁴⁰ But good relations were to end.

Building recovered in the 1890s, demand for slate increased, but Penrhyn refused to raise wages even though he was reputed to have made £ 100,000 in 1898

and 1899. From September 1896 to August 1897 the workers were locked out. Resumption of work followed the dismissal of those who had sought to petition Lord Penrhyn for wage increases. In 1900 subscription to the union was prohibited on the site and the dispute broke into the open. After violence, arrests, and trial where twenty of the twenty-six arrested were found not guilty, the quarry company closed the quarry for the winter and in the following summer hired nonunion workers. The work force divided, bitterness abounded, and after two and one half years the workers capitulated.

While Penrhyn had won, it was pyrrhic, the disruption in the domestic slate business had opened a window of opportunity for other roofing products and for foreign slate. Neither side in the conflict ever recovered completely.

Mining, especially for coal, was a hallmark business of Britain from the eighteenth century onwards. It was a hard and dangerous occupation. The owners of mines could either be 'improving' or not. Many of those who were associated in this Parliament with this business were, though the one exception was most notable and somewhat self-destructive. Colliery owners often would extend their business into other ores, especially iron, and sometimes iron ore producers would head into coal. While many of those listed above attended public schools (including Penrhyn, two at Eton, two at Clifton, and one at Tottenham), the companies seem to have been well managed during their administration, and, except for Penrhyn, they seem to have been among the more progressive of the owners. *Hickman*, a graduate of a grammar school, invested in research and technology, and *Joicey*, also a grammar school

graduate, a son of an engineer, had trained as a clerk before joining his uncle's firm. While some of the above would reinforce Wiener's point, that is, that those who were not spoiled by a public school education would be the most progressive in management of their businesses, two counter-points are worth noting. First, *Blundell* was willing to hire and fire operators. That is, he would seek out talent and utilize them. Wiener does not make room in his arguments for this succeeding generation of what Coleman calls the 'practical' men. Were not such men available? And was not there a strong likelihood that the heirs of the previous generation of practical men would use them in their businesses? And second, Wiener's placing the blame on later family members for troubles in these particular businesses seems a bit of a stretch, since it is notable that these businesses, ones which collapsed in the post war economy, were often businesses which were nationalized in the late 1940's and 1950s (and sometimes denationalized before being renationalized.)

In addition to the slide in coal and iron and steel, Barnett listed shipbuilding as the third major industry whose slide greatly injured Britain's economy. Six shipbuilding MPs from the Parliament of 1895-1900 are also listed in the Dictionary of Business Biography.

Sir Charles Mark Palmer, born in 1822 and educated by Dr. J. C. Bruce at the Percy Street Academy in Newcastle, developed business interests in coal and later iron. By the 1850s the company Palmer headed approached one million tons in output. Palmer moved into shipbuilding to provide steamships to transport his coal around Great Britain. Rapid construction with iron plates of a floating battery for the

Crimean War opened opportunities for the construction of additional ships for the Royal Navy and foreign navies. Palmer integrated backward into iron and steel making and the Palmer Shipyards at Jarrow became a classic example of a well integrated firm. *Palmer* did have his failure, however, a glassworks which he had to shut down after high losses. The shipyard survived into the twentieth century, merging with Vickers Armstrong, but was eventually closed in the 1930s.⁴¹

William Donaldson Cruddas, MP, (1831-1912) for thirty years oversaw the finances of W. G. Armstrong Company. His father had been an early and substantial backer of Armstrong and had insisted therefore in assuming control of the company's finances. He trained his son, *William*, to follow him. We have no other information about *William's* education. *William* also served on the boards of the Newcastle and Gateshead Water company and the Newcastle Daily Journal. He died leaving in excess of £ 1,000,000 to his wife and three daughters.⁴² Armstrongs merged with Vickers and absorbed Palmer shipbuilding. By the 1960s Vickers was heavily involved with aircraft and merged with Rolls Royce in 1999.⁴³

Charles Benjamin Bright McLaren was the nephew of John Bright, being the son of Bright's sister, Priscilla. Educated at Tottenham and the University of Edinburgh, he was called to the bar at Lincoln's Inn. He specialized in commercial law. His wife, Laura, was the only daughter and sole heir of Henry Davis Pochin, a chemical manufacturer, who had extensive outside interests.

Upon the death of his father-in-law, *McLaren* assumed the Chairmanship of Tredegar Iron and Coal Company, in 1904 the Chairmanship of the Metropolitan

Railway, Chairmanship of Palmer's Shipbuilding and Iron Company (to 1910) and of the Sheepbridge Coal and Iron Company. In 1882, he had joined the board of John Brown and Company, became deputy Chairman in 1897 and assumed the chairmanship in 1906. John Brown, like Palmer's, was a major shipbuilding company. *McLaren* was Chairman until 1934; through fat times, the building of the *Lusitania* and *Aquitania* in the late 1900s and early nineteen-teens, the building of the *Inflexible*, *Bristol*, *Tiger*, *Barham*, *Repulse*, and *Hood* during the war, and then the lean times up to Cunard's order for the *Queen Mary* in 1934.

His son followed him as Chairman of John Brown and in turn was succeeded by his son. This grandson led the company through an unsuccessful merger in the 1960s. With the failure of this merger, John Brown engineering was separated from the shipyards and continues today as a division of C B & I Industries.⁴⁴

The two original principals of the firm of Harland and Wolff were elected to this Parliament, though *Sir Edward James Harland* (born 1831) died in January 1896 and thus did not take an active part in this Parliament. Sir Edward had been educated at Sunderland Grammar School and Edinburgh Academy. He served an apprenticeship at Robert Stephenson and Company and later joined the engine building firm of I. & G. Thomson, using a letter of introduction from James Bibby of the shipping firm J. Bibby and Son at the instigation of Gustav Christian Schwabe, a part owner of the shipping firm, and a friend of Harland. Within three years he was in Belfast working for Robert Hickson and Company, an ironmonger who had a shipyard as a side business. Four years later Hickson sold him his firm. It is

suspected that Schwabe may have financed the deal because Schwabe's nephew, *Gustav Wilhelm Wolff*, became Harland's partner.⁴⁵

Wolff was born in 1834 in Hamburg.⁴⁶ His father was a successful merchant and his mother, Fanny, was the sister of Gustav Schwabe. *Wolff* was educated at private schools in Hamburg and continued his education in engineering at the Collegiate Schools, Liverpool. After an apprenticeship at Mssrs. Joseph Whitworth and Company and at Mssrs. Goodfellow and Company, through Uncle Gustav, *Wolff* obtained a position as an assistant to *Edmund Harland* when he was running Hickson's shipyard. Harland and *Wolff* decided to try to find a yard of their own to purchase, but were unsuccessful. Hickson meanwhile, worried about replacing Harland's excellent management at his shipyard, decided the prudent course would be to sell the yard to *Harland* and *Wolff*.

Schwabe was not only an uncle but also the guardian angel of this operation, probably funding the initial purchase price, convincing J. Bibby and Son (in which Schwabe had an interest) to make multiple purchases of ships, and in 1869, convincing Thomas Henry Ismay (reputedly during a game of billiards) to build at Harland and *Wolff* a fleet of iron ships for the Atlantic Trade. Supposedly Schwabe promised financing for Ismay. The resulting relationship was so filled with trust that for the next fifty-four years Harland and *Wolff* would build the White Star Line's ships without a written contract.

When *Harland* had arrived at Hickson's shipyard it was just under two acres in size. By the time of Ismay's initial order the yard comprised about nine and a half

acres and employed 2,400 men, in 1880 it was forty acres and fifteen years after that it was eighty acres and employed 8,000. 'By then Harland and Wolff had become the largest single shipbuilder in the world, with (from 1880) its own boiler and machine tools shops, and its own engine works.'⁴⁷ By 1913, when *Wolff* died, employment had reached 16,000, and the company had launched 430 ships at over 2.2 million gross tons.

However, as *Harland* had no children and *Wolff* never married, succession was solved by bringing in others as partners. William James Pirrie and Walter H. Wilson had been made partners in 1874 and Pirrie came to dominate the firm. *Harland* had withdrawn from active management in the company in the decade following 1874, and *Wolff*, though he stayed active, mainly oversaw the company's finances and did not challenge Pirrie's leadership. The company built ocean liners through the early nineteen twenties as well as warships during both wars. Following World War Two, liners were built through the nineteen fifties, but with the decline in trans-Atlantic sailing, and the rise of competition from Japan, the company suffered. Nationalized in the late seventies, it was privatized in the 1990s and has built and rehabilitated oil platforms and some roll-on, roll off vessels and most recently has specialized in engineering.

The shipbuilding companies which had owners or officers (or future officers) in this Parliament who were also in the Dictionary of Business Biography, sought different solutions to the problem of succession and continued existence. Harland and Wolff went outside of family for successors to the owner/managers choosing a

'practical' man (Pirrie) as successor. Others merged or sold out. Some residual businesses still exist, engineering, oil platform building, roll-on roll-off shipbuilding. None, including Pirrie, the successor at Harland and Wolff, were attendees of public schools. But the 1960s saw the end of the building of the great ships, and this also affected the following business.

William Theodore Doxford (1841-1916)⁴⁸, after attending Branham College, joined his father in the setting up of a shipyard on the river Wear. Seemingly this was the third time his father had attempted to run his own shipyard, two previous attempts having shut down. This latest venture finally took off in 1864 when Doxford's started building iron ships with output tripling from 3109 tons of shipping built in 1864 to 9574 tons in 1872. In 1878 Doxfords started building their own engines under the direction of William's brother, Robert Pyle (1851-1932). They developed a successful model of ship, the 'Turret', a screw steamer cargo ship of which they built many. Between 1905 and 1907 'the company built a greater tonnage than any other shipyard in Britain.'⁴⁹ They also developed successful marine diesel engines, and it was in this field that the company in the twentieth century would specialize. Doxford's son succeeded him. The company finally ceased operations in 1980. Although their engines were considered some of the best produced, after the local industry was succeeded by overseas rivals, it was not practicable for the company to try to install their engines in ships built on the continent of Europe, much less in distant Asian countries.

Another engine company was represented in this elite group of less than seventy businessmen. *William Johnson Galloway*, MP⁵⁰ (Wellington College and Cambridge) was the son and successor to John Galloway, a partner with his father and cousins in W. and J. Galloway and Sons, originally ironfounders and subsequently boiler and stationary steam engine manufacturers. John Galloway was involved with the company when it flourished from the late 1830s to 1890. By then it had manufactured about 8,200 boilers and hundreds of engines. The company continued to do well up to the war, but by 1921 was having difficulty and shut down in the 1920s as stationary engines became dominated by electrical powered products.

Yet another engine builder was *James Kitson*, later Lord Airedale of Gledhow.⁵¹ His father, also named James, who had been apprenticed in a dye works and had attended a mechanics institute, had begun a partnership to build locomotives which evolved into the Airedale Foundry at Hunslet. Our *James* attended Wakefield Proprietary School and University College, London where he studied chemistry and natural sciences. The family expanded the Airedale foundry by acquiring Monkbridge Iron Works in a form of vertical integration. After 1862 our *James* assumed control of the firm. 'Almost 6000 engines were built at Airedale Foundry for 48 railway companies at home and 80 companies in 28 countries abroad. Although the firm concentrated on locomotives, some diversification took place through the manufacture of stationary engines for agricultural machinery and steam engines for tramways. At Monkbridge, steel was produced from the 1880s on a small scale by the Siemens-Martin open-hearth process, and after 1900 the foundry was equipped

with electrical motors. In 1912 the company employed 2000 workmen.’⁵² The company finally closed in the nineteen-thirties, after an expensive attempt at development of a diesel-steam hybrid locomotive.⁵³

Thus we have three engine builders which ceased operations because for the first, their customer’s (ship yards) business ‘sailed’ away to the continent or to Asia, for the second, the development of a distinctly new form of engine drive system, electrical, which was more efficient and convenient for the user than steam engines, thus destroying the demand for their products, and third, steam locomotives were replaced by diesel engines. It is hard to lay the blame for the destruction of these business models at the feet of these company’s subsequent management. The builders of the ship engines might have been able to relocate elsewhere in the world, but the culture into which they would have moved probably would not have accepted them, and further, supplier relationships for the European and Asian shipbuilders had already developed over time. As for Galloway, they continued to develop their technology, but electrical based engines are completely different and it is not clear how they would have jumped that chasm. They might have gone into other forms of boilers, but those niches were probably already crowded, perhaps unprofitable, and probably shrinking. Sometimes it is just best to close. And in the case of Airedale, again the technology moved in a completely different direction. One of these men attended a public school, Galloway at Wellington, one at what probably was a public school, Doxford at Branham College, and the third, Kitson, at a private school.

Shipbuilder's customers are ship owners. Over the course of the nineteenth century the United Kingdom emerged with the world's largest merchant fleet under her flag. Five MPs in Victoria's last Parliament can be identified in the Dictionary of Business Biography as ship owners, as well as the father of another MP, *Walter Runciman*. *Sir Donald Currie* (1825-1909), *Sir Robert Patterson Houston* (1853-1926), *John Rankin* (1845-1928), *Charles H. Wilson* (1833-1907), and *Sir William B. Forwood* (1840-1928) were successful ship owners in differing parts of the trade.

Currie was the third of ten children. Educated at the Belfast Academy and the Royal Belfast Academic Institution, he subsequently worked in the shipping office of an uncle and later for the British & North American Royal Mail Steam Packet Company, which had been founded by Samuel Cunard. He became head of Cunard's cargo department. In 1862 he left to set up his own company. While he started by sailing to India, by 1872 he had turned his attention to Africa and began the Castle Packet Company. Because of his African contacts he invested in mining companies and had large interests in copper mines and was involved in the formation of De Beers. He sat on that company's board from 1888-1902. Castle lines merged with Union, their chief competitor, in 1900, and *Currie* died nine years later leaving nearly £ 2, 500,000.⁵⁴

Houston was educated at Liverpool College and followed his father into marine engineering. At age twenty-one he became superintendent engineer at the National Line. Within three years he was a part owner in a 356 ton ship. Four years after that he was running his own fledgling fleet. His technique was tramp shipping,

constantly looking for opportunities as they presented themselves: shipping building materials to the French led Panama Canal site, freighting to Africa and South America, extending his routes to the Plate River and New York, shipping supplies from the United Kingdom, United States, and South America to British Forces during the Boer War. Later he successfully fought with other shippers for routes to South Africa. Constantly improving his fleet, he would shop shipyards looking for inexpensive newly constructed basic cargo ships when he needed a new vessel. During the World War I he lost about 30% of his fleet and decided to sellout to the Clan Line in 1918 for a reputed £2,000,000.⁵⁵ After a series of mergers over the next sixty years, the successor firm, British and Commonwealth Line, finally shut down in 1977.⁵⁶

John Rankin, whose early years were spent in Canada, was sent back to England at age nine to attend Dr. Ihne's School and Madras College. *Rankin's* family had been involved with the Liverpool branch of the early 19th century timber firm of Pollock, Gilmour and Company which was called Rankin, Gilmour and Company. At age sixteen he joined the family firm and ten years later, 1871, became a partner. At this time the interrelated firms were consolidating, closing offices, and disbanding as the nature of their business changed, as the margins in the previous mercantile operations were squeezed through the increase in speed of communications brought about by the telegraph, and the shrinkage of margins through the growing use of the futures markets. By 1890 the Liverpool company had become primarily ship owners and operators. By the time of World War I they had sixteen ships of approximately

four thousand tons each. Four ships were lost during the war and in December 1917 the *Rankin's* sold the remaining twelve for almost £2,000,000.⁵⁷

Walter Runciman senior, father of *Walter Runciman* an MP in this Parliament who would go on to have a distinguished career in government, was the son of a sea captain. Following in his father's footsteps, at age twelve he signed on as a cabin boy on a collier. Later he sailed on the high seas, became a mate, then master, and for thirteen years, 1871-1884, remained in command on the seas. Ill health forced retirement but soon he had purchased a twelve hundred ton steamer. In 1892 this son *Walter*, educated privately and at Cambridge, joined him in the business and in 1895 the name of the line was changed to the Moor Line. It also was a tramp shipping firm with as many as twenty-five ships and by the time of the war had grown to forty ships. However, losses during the war were high - twenty-six ships, and pressure came from other shareholders to liquidate, and so the firm was.

Several years later, after the initial postwar boom, prices on new ships fell and the Runcimans resurrected the firm. A decade later they purchased Anchor Lines. Walter senior was succeeded by his son (BA, MA Trinity College, Cambridge)⁵⁸ and his grandson (Eton, BA, MA Trinity College, Cambridge)⁵⁹

Charles H. Wilson (educated at a local school in Hull) was the eighth son of Thomas Wilson, founder of Thomas Wilson, Sons and Company of Hull. The senior Wilson was a Swedish iron bar trader. He brought his two older sons into the business and then placed the other five out in other trades. However, when the elder son inherited an uncle's successful wine import business, and the second son, having

been sent to Sweden, became naturalized there, Thomas Wilson took his eighth and ninth (Arthur) sons into the business. From 1860 to 1907 *Charles* and Arthur took control of the business, bought out their father, expanded outside the Baltic, constantly upgraded their fleet, and by 1907 had ninety-two steamers totaling 192,000 tons. Profits grew from £ 15,000 per annum in 1861 to almost £300,000 in 1891. The sons reaped the reward for their work by buying estates (11,000 acres between them) and *Charles* serving in Parliament for nearly a third of a century. During the war they sold to John Ellerman for more than £ 4,000,000.⁶⁰

Arthur B. Forwood was born to Thomas Brittain Forwood, a partner in the merchant shipping firm of Leech, Harrison and Forwood of Liverpool. He attended the Liverpool Collegiate School. *Arthur* was in the United States just before the election of 1860 and, sensing a looming civil war, bought large quantities of cotton. When *Arthur* was twenty-six he and his brother, William, succeeded their father and embarked on building a fleet of steamships. They concentrated on the West Indies trade and blockade running to the Confederacy. They formed a large company, West Indian and Pacific Steamship Company which, in 1878, had fourteen ships and eventually was sold when *Arthur* decided to enter politics. Eventually, after several subsequent sales, this company also wound up in Ellerman's hands.⁶¹

Thus, of the six shipowning firms, four sold out to others (two eventually to Ellerman), one merged, and the remaining firm liquidated when prices for ships was high and then the owners bought back into the trade after the collapse of ship prices.

As is seen in the industries above, consolidations, whether through sales or mergers, were a way of dealing with competition, overcapacity, and changing circumstances. This can be seen in the textile industry as well. Of eight we will deal with: *Sir Angus Holden's* UK company (there were separate operations in France which closed in 1914 and 1938) was absorbed by Woolcomber's in 1964;⁶² *Anthony Mundella's* hosiery business was incorporated as the Nottingham Manufacturing Company which was still in operation in 1957;⁶³ *Sir Mark Oldroyd's* blanket firm at Dewsbury was sold to a subsidiary of the British Industrial Corporation, Ltd. in 1920, went through wrenching financial crises in the 1930s, with the mills finally closing in 1959, the family having exited in 1920;⁶⁴ *Sir William Henry Foster's* family firm, John Foster's Black Dyke Mills, is again an independent firm and doing well;⁶⁵ Samuel Morley's successful hosiery firm (third son, *Charles*, was a MP from 1895-1900) grew from £100,000 sales in 1830 to £1,000,000 in 1859, to £2,000,000 in 1871, £2,800,000 in 1886 (the year of Samuel's death) and peaked at £6,700,000 in 1919 before falling away.⁶⁶ Later the firm merged with Courtaulds.⁶⁷

Meanwhile, in 1898 the Fine Cotton Spinners and Doublers association was formed from thirty-one firms including *Sir William Houldsworth's* Thomas Houldsworth and Company and Reddish Spinning Company (which was thirteen percent in value of the new firm),⁶⁸ and *William Henry Holland's* cotton firm.⁶⁹ In 1920, Fine Cotton Spinners and Doublers brought *George Harwood's* company (which was by then under the direction of his son, Harold Marsh Harwood (Marlborough; Trinity College, Cambridge; MD, St. Thomas' Hospital) and in 1940

Harold was appointed Chairman of Fine Cotton Spinners. He was an active Chairman and by his retirement in 1950 profits were £ 2,900,000 versus £ 614,000 in 1941, and assets were £ 12,400,000 versus £ 6,600,000 in 1941.⁷⁰ In the 1950s Fine Cotton merged into Courtaulds.⁷¹ Thus much of the history of the English textile trade in the twentieth century as represented by the companies of our Parliamentarians can be characterized as purchase, merger, and consolidation. The education of these men included two public schools, Wesley College, Sheffield (Holden) and the short-lived Bramham College (Holland), one attended Liverpool's Royal Institution Grammar school for boys (Foster) and the rest were privately schooled or their education is unknown. Thus two of eight were at public schools and one attended a well-known grammar.

Besides ships, iron and steel can be used for smaller items. *Sir Frederick Thorpe Mappin*,⁷² one of our MPs, co-owned a cutlery business, inherited from his father (who had founded it in 1825), but left that business after a partnership dispute (the company would become Mappin and Webb under the direction of his brother, John Newton Mappin (1836-1913),⁷³ and continues today.) *Sir Frederick* subsequently bought Thomas Turton and Sons, an iron firm which also owned William Greaves and Sons 'whose sheaf works had in 1823 been the first large-scale factory created in the Sheffield cutlery industry.'⁷⁴ Turtons specialized in railway spring manufacturing and files. The company still exists, now supplying hydraulic and pneumatic tools.⁷⁵

William Kenrick, MP (whose wife was sister of Joseph Chamberlain) was Chairman of Archibald Kenrick and Sons, Ltd. which had been founded in 1791. They were hollowware manufacturers and continued in that business through the first half of the twentieth century. After the Second World War William's grandson, William Edward (Rugby and Balliol College, Oxford) took control of the firm, closed the foundry and reoriented the company to hardware and, in the 1950s, castors.⁷⁶ Today the company is still in business, 217 years after its foundation, noted for its castors and builder's hardware.⁷⁷

Joseph Chamberlain was famously in the hardware business: screws, bolts, etc.⁷⁸ He was a hard-nosed and successful businessman but, in 1874, sold his family's interest in the screw works to their partners (and cousins), the Nettlefolds, for a reputed £ 600,000. The company merged with others to become Guest, Keen and Nettlefolds, Ltd. After the nationalization, privatization, then partial renationalization of British steelmaking, the company decided to exit the screw and bolt business. Today, known as G K N, it is a world leader in automotive drive trains, powder metallurgy and aerospace (consisting of the former Sanders-Rae, forerunner of G K N Aerospace, and Westlands). In 2001, G K N amalgamated its pallet business and waste disposal business with Australia's Brambles Group, receiving, 43% of Brambles stock (which was then distributed to G K N shareholders.) The company's revenues in 2007 exceeded £ 4,000,000,000.⁷⁹

All four of these businesses continue today, having evolved into fields different from, but to some extent related to, their previous businesses. *Chamberlain*

had attended University College School – London (a school known as being ‘progressive’ and for teaching modern languages and science), while *Kenrick* had attended a proprietary school and University College, London, and *Mappin’s* education is unknown.

Two of the three major British imperial and international construction contracting firms were represented in this Parliament, *John Aird’s* (1833-1911) and *Weetman Pearson’s* (1856-1927), the third being the firm headed by John Jackson. *John Aird’s* father, a gas works superintendent, formed his own contracting firm in 1848, specializing in gas and water mains. After receiving a private education at Greenwich and Southgate at age eighteen, *John* joined his father. Within three years he was given control of the Berlin Water Company, a partnership of Sir Charles Fox, Thomas Crompton, and the senior Mr. Aird. Over the next eighteen years *John* managed the construction of water and gas lines and drainage systems abroad, as well as gas lines, docks, and railways in the Kingdom. After 1895, he was heavily involved in projects within the empire and its dependencies. *Aird* retired after a stroke in 1908 and died in 1911. The firm was taken over by his sons and a son-in-law. An unsuccessful contract in Singapore for docks wound up costing the company £ 1,000,000 and the third generation wound up the company.⁸⁰

Pearson’s firm, on the other hand, is still going strong. Founded in 1844 by Samuel Pearson, *Weetman Pearson’s* grandfather, the company initially had a brickworks and undertook railway and water supply contracting. *Weetman* attended Halifield school in Bradford and then Pannal College at Harrogate. At age sixteen he

went to work in the family business, earned his grandfather's confidence and, when Samuel retired, his grandfather's interest in the company. Over the next thirty-five years *Pearson* secured contracts totaling about £ 43,000,000 building docks in the United Kingdom and North America, railway and port works in Mexico, tunnels in the United States, Mexico and the United Kingdom, and some work in South America.

He rationalized the contracting company by building a permanent staff, finding and promoting associates to oversee different departments and different contracts, constantly seeking more efficient means of building, and improving dredging devices and tunneling shields. Also he was able to spot opportunities as they arose. For example, once when traveling from a project in Mexico through the United States, he arrived in Texas as the Spindletop discovery was made.

Remembering an area in Mexico where oil seepage was a problem, he telegraphed his representatives to secure mineral rights in the area. This led to the formation of *Aguila Oil* in 1901 (sold to Royal Dutch-Shell in 1919 for £8,000,000) and he later was involved in the formation of *Amerada Oil* in the United States. He acquired, in partnership with Lazard Freres of Paris, a half interest in Lazard Brothers of London. In 1908 he bought a partial interest in the *Westminster Gazette* to which he added a group of United Kingdom provincial papers in 1921.

He was a major benefactor. Cowdray Hospital in Mexico City, Cambridge's Chemical department, University of Birmingham's School of Mining, University College, London, and the Aberdeen Art Museum, among other organizations,

received substantial sums from him. Weetman Pearson died in 1927 leaving in excess of £4,000,000.⁸¹ The company continues, now called Pearson, PLC, with sales of £4,160,000,000. It owns, among other things: Longmans, Putnams, Scott Foresman, Simon and Schuster, Viking, Prentice Hall, Addison Wesley, Penguin, and, bought most recently, Harcourt, and is the owner, as well, of one half of The Economist Company through Pearson's ownership of the Financial Times.⁸² The Financial Times, by the way, was founded in 1888, four years after the Financial News was founded by one of our MPs, *Harry Hammel Marks* (educated in Brussels and at the University of London.) In 1945 the Financial Times and the Financial News were merged, and Pearson's bought the Financial Times in 1957.

While in *Aird's* case we have the second generation failing in the business, in *Pearson's* we have one of the premier information companies of the twentieth century which evolved out of a totally different business. Opportunities were recognized by the company's third generation owner, and these have been further developed in the eighty years since his death by professional managers. *Aird* was privately educated, *Pearson* privately and at Pannal College.

There are three MPs, *Augustus H. E. Alhusen*, *Sir John T. Brunner*, and *Frederick William Fison*, whose family firms were in chemicals. *Alhusen's* grandfather was born in Kiel and migrated into the United Kingdom, to Newcastle upon Tyne, in 1825 to join two older brothers. Subsequently his two brothers moved elsewhere and Alhusen formed another partnership dealing in grain, shipping, and insurance. In 1840 this broke up and Alhusen purchased the then inactive Tyneside

soap works of Charles Attwood and Company, and began manufacturing alkali using the Leblanc process. Alhusen and other Tyneside manufacturers gave a boost to the Teeside manufacturers by instigating the drilling for salt, a basic material for alkali, beside the Tee.⁸⁴

The Leblanc process was superseded by the Solway process brought to England, specifically to the Teeside, by *Sir John Brunner* (taught by his father, a schoolmaster) and his partner, Ludwig Mond. Beginning their partnership in 1873, by 1877 the firm was showing a profit and in 1881 it became a public company.⁸⁵ In 1890, Alhusen died and the Tyneside chemical makers merged into one company, United Alkali Company.⁸⁶ Following the First World War United Alkali, Brunner Mond, and others formed Imperial Chemical Industries (ICI).⁸⁷ *Augustus Henry Allhusen*, our MP, had been educated at Cheltenham, while his father, Henry Christian (who worked in the chemical business before his death in 1871) had been educated at Repton. Even though, or perhaps because, *Augustus*, an heir, was educated at a public school, a way of securing the future of the company was found through merger.

Toward the end of the eighteenth century James Fison of Barningham, England, entered the grain milling and baking business.⁸⁸ His son expanded to include maltings. In 1808, James Fison and Sons was formed which, by 1840, was doing a respectable £ 100,000 a year in sales. By 1850 the firm was in the fertilizer business and later pesticides. In 1895 the company split into two separate operations (our MP, *Frederick William*, a Rugby and Oxford man, was senior partner in Fison

and Company), and during the First World War, while the companies were making munitions, a designated family heir, Larimer, died of pneumonia resulting from poison gas. Frank Guy Clovering Fison (not the son of our MP),⁸⁹ educated at Charterhouse and Christ Church, Oxford, and who had studied medicine, became heir apparent. Sir Clovering (as he was later known) ran the company until 1962. During that time he remerged the two separated Fison companies; rationalized production; purchased a host of other firms, mainly in fertilizers but also in pharmaceuticals and scientific equipment. By the time of his retirement in 1962 sales had grown to £54,000,000 and profits to £2,710,000. Subsequent, non-family professional management did well, for awhile, but it suffered a series of crises in the 1970s (the United Kingdom, for instance, instituted price controls on fertilizer while the prices on the components of fertilizer were not so regulated, consequently profits on this line of business, one which had sustained the company for nearly one hundred years, became impossible.) They lost important customers in agrochemicals and became overly dependent on one pharmaceutical product. In the 1980s John Kerridge took control, sold fertilizers and agrochemicals, and eliminated overhead, concentrating on pharmaceuticals, horticulture, and scientific equipment. Expansion into the United States followed. However, the economic troubles of the early 1990s made the company vulnerable, and it was purchased by Rhone Poulenc Rorer for just short of three billion dollars.⁹⁰

Richard Pilkington's (MP, Lancaster – Newton, education unknown) business was glass manufacturing, Pilkington Brothers. This family owned company had been

founded in 1826. *Richard's* nephew, Richard Austin Pilkington (1871-1951) (Shrewsbury, Brasenose College, Oxford) was working at the company and approximately a decade after returning from a medical sabbatical, became Chairman of the company in the 1920s. Pilkington's had not been able to develop or acquire a license for continuous sheet glass, but by 1930 they had, courtesy of Pittsburgh Plate Glass (PPG). After an unusual loss for a quarter in 1931, Richard Austin resigned in favor of his brother-in-law, the third Lord Cozens-Hardy. At about the start of the war, in early 1939, Cozens-Hardy retired and his successor, R. M. Weeks, entered the military during the war (General Weeks) and never returned.

Richard Austin's son, William Henry (Harry) Pilkington (Rugby, Magdalene College, Cambridge) joined the company along with a cousin, son of a Pilkington daughter, Douglas Phelps. In 1947 Phelps became chairman of the executive committee, and in 1949 Harry Pilkington became chairman of the Company. Over the next twenty-four years Pilkington ran the company. In 1946 the capital base of the company was £ 7,500,000 which grew to £174,000,000 in 1970, and over the same period sales grew from £ 9,000,000 to £123,000,000.⁹¹

Polished sheet glass was an expensive process, and in the early 1950s a research scientist, Alastair Pilkington (1920-1995) (Sherwood School, Trinity College, Cambridge) who was not immediately related to the company's founding family, conceived the idea of making sheet glass by floating it over molten lead. Sir Harry (knighted in 1953) strongly backed Alastair, and after seven years the process was perfected and licensed to others in the industry, starting with PPG in 1962. The

license produced up to £ 38,000,000 per year in royalties. The company went public in 1970, Sir Harry, now Lord Pilkington of St. Helens, retired in 1973. Sir Alastair Pilkington, though not family, also became Chairman. Lord Pilkington died in 1983, Sir Alastair in 1995.⁹² In 2006 Pilkingtons reluctantly accepted a buyout offer which netted the shareholders in excess of £2,200,000,000.⁹³

Above we have four companies in heavy industries. Two wound up merged into one of the largest of the United Kingdom's public company's, Imperial Chemical. Fison's was reorganized by a family member, who left it in good order when he retired and it was turned over to professional, non-family, management. Subsequently it had to exit one of its basic businesses because of government action, but evolved toward other businesses. In spite of professional management it then suffered a series of set backs, but nevertheless was sold for a large sum of money. And Pilkington Glass, run by family members, survived, developed a significant improvement in the process of glass making, collected sizable royalties, invested its funds wisely, and later was sold for a substantial amount, only a few years ago. Both Fison and Pilkington were run quite successfully by public school educated family members.

Henry Clarke Stephens (1841 - 1918, MP 1887 - 1900) (University College School and part-time in chemistry, Government School of Mines), known as 'Inky' Stephens, was the son of Dr. Henry Stephens, a physician who invented the company's ink formula as a sideline. Upon his father's death in 1864 *Henry* assumed management of the company and at age 27 became legal partner with his sister and

mother. He was a master of promotion and expanded the company's reach overseas. The company did well into the middle of the twentieth century but suffered as pen technology changed. However, descendants still own other investments such as the Chalderdon District Water Company.⁹⁴

Ink takes paper. *Sir Albert Spicer, M P* (1847 - 1934) (Mill Hill, Heidelberg) was a member of a family well known in the paper industry. But because of a dispute in his father's generation there were two Spicer family paper firms: Spicer Brothers and James Spicer and Sons. *Albert* was recognized as being a dynamic businessman and reorganized his family's company. Salesmen were based in local territories rather than traveling from the home office. *Albert* expanded the company's geographic reach by marketing the company's products outside the Kingdom, and by being responsive to specialty needs of customers. In 1910 James Spicer incorporated and in 1922 the two family firms reunited with *Albert* serving one year (1923) as Chairman. Subsequently the company continued and was acquired by Australia Paper in 2001. In *Sir Albert* we have another example of a public school educated scion who very successfully ran his company, a company which continued its independent existence into the twenty-first century.⁹⁵

New forms of communication arose in the course of the nineteenth century. *John Pender* (1816 – 1896, High School - Glasgow) was a Manchester cotton merchant who became involved in telegraphy first through the English and Irish Telegraph company and later the Atlantic Telegraph Company, the British - Indian Submarine Telegraph Company, Falmouth, Gibraltar and Malta Telegraph Company,

British - Indian Extension Telegraph Company, British Australian Telegraph Company, Eastern Telegraph Company, China Submarine Company, all of which were eventually absorbed into the Eastern and Associated Telegraph Company. Under the Imperial Telegraphs Act of 1929, *Pender's* companies were merged with the Marconi Company to form Cable and Wireless.⁹⁶ His son, Sir John Denison-Pender (University College, London); grandson, John Cuthbert Denison-Pender, First Baron Pender (Eton); and great - grandson, John Jocelyn Dennison-Pender, second Baron (Eton), were all involved in the companies and successor companies, at least as directors, usually as Chairman or Governor. Additionally, great - great - grandson, John Willoughby Dennison - Pender, Third Baron Pender (Eton), was a director of another family company, Global Trust Company.⁹⁷

Old industries survived into this era, tanning being an example. *William Lawies Jackson* (1840 – 1917, privately educated), later First Lord Allerton of Chapel Allerton, followed his father, William, into the tanning business in Leeds upon his father's death in 1858. He built up the largest tanneries in England, covering nine acres, employing two hundred, producing 300,000 hides a year. *Jackson* entered politics locally on the Leeds Town Council. In 1880, he was elected to Parliament and occupied a seat for the more than the next twenty years. He became Financial Secretary to the Treasury (1885 - 1891) under Lord Randolph Churchill, and was Chief Secretary of Ireland for nine months (1891 - 1892). He was elevated to the Peerage in 1902. His sons did not follow him into the business and *Jackson* found it necessary to appoint a manager. The company was wound up in 1912. The oldest

son succeeded to the title, the other pursued a military career and was noted for his cricket skills, playing on the national team.⁹⁸

In recent years the importance of contingency has become a central concept in explanations for historical events. The story of *William Woodall* is just such a case. Born in 1832 to the manager of a gasworks, he attended the Crescent School in Liverpool. He followed his father into the utility business becoming general manager, at age 25, of the gasworks at Burslem. In 1862, *William* married Evelyn, daughter of James Macintyre, a pottery manufacturer. *William* became a partner in his father-in-law's business. In 1868 James Macintyre died leaving the company in trust for his daughter for her 'sole use', but held in trust for eventual heirs. Unfortunately Evelyn died childless in 1870 and *William* was left in charge of a company which could provide him a living, but which would at his death revert to his wife's niece. He ran the company well. It had taken out patents in the 1860s for fashioning odd shaped china, it had developed 'ivory china' for the backs of hairbrushes, and in 1887 it was producing china bases for electrical fittings which led to industrial ceramics becoming a mainstay for the firm. Also, Florian ware was invented and patented by William Moorcroft, a Macintyre employee, in the 1890s. When *Woodall* died in 1901, the company's employment rolls had recently exceeded four hundred. The decorative side was closed in 1910 and Moorcroft went on to form his own company.⁹⁹

James Stuart, MP, was professor of applied mechanics at Cambridge (his pre-university education is unknown, university education was St. Andrews and

Cambridge). In 1898 his father-in-law unexpectedly died and *Stuart* was called on to help with the family company, J and J Colman of Norwich. His father-in-law, Jeremiah James Colman (J. J.) had been instrumental in the success of the firm from 1850 to his death. In 1850 the company, then based at Stoke Holy Cross near Norwich, had 250 employees, by J. J.'s death, it had 3,000 employees at Carrow on the outskirts of Norwich. From a flour and mustard milling business, the company added other 'consumer' goods such as starch, laundry blue, and cornstarch. The company had its own tin shop, printing department, papermill, sawmill, and cooperage. In 1903, under J. J.'s successors, the Colmans bought Keen Robinson, their main rival, and in 1938 Colmans merged with Reckett and Sons, Ltd. Colmans was spun off in 1995 and now is owned by Unilever.¹⁰⁰

Another foodstuff was biscuits and in particular, Palmer's Biscuit Company. In 1841 a partnership between Thomas Huntley and George Palmer, father of *George William Palmer*, Liberal MP for Reading (where the factory was located) was formed to continue the operations of the previous Huntley Biscuit Company. Under George Palmer's direction the company became the first to have a continuously running biscuit manufacturing operation. From sales of £2,700 in 1841 by 1857 when Huntley died and his estate was bought out sales had grown to £125,000 (profits £18,000) and after another seventeen years (1874) sales approached £920,000 and profits £120,000. After the death of the first generation the later generations may not have been as successful in maintaining market share (it shrank to eight percent of the national biscuit consumption), but Palmers merged with Peek Frean and Jacobs to

form Associated Biscuit which was continually headed by a Palmer until the company was sold to Nabisco in 1982.¹⁰¹ Our MP, *George William*, had been educated at Grove House, Tottenham.

Three other MPs who are listed in the Dictionary were involved in consumer goods - all 'sins'. *Sir Henry Cosmo Orme Bonsor, Bart.*, (Eton) was head of Combe and Company brewers which later merged with Watney and Reid to form Watney, Combe, and Reid, one of London's largest brewers. The company, as Watney, Mann, continues to today. *Bonsor's* son, Arthur (Eton), was Chairman in the late 1940s and his grandson, Sir Bryan (Eton), served on Watney's board for many years.¹⁰²

Tobacco is another one of the 'sins'. *William Henry Wills*, MP for Bristol East, (Mill Hill, University College, London) was Chairman of W. D. and H. O. Wills, Tobacco Merchants. The company had been founded in 1786 and in the years preceeding this Parliament had secured the exclusive rights to the patent for the Bonsack cigarette making machine, and consequently introduced the one pence Woodbine cigarette. *William Henry's* income over the course of our Parliament reputedly quadrupled from £50,000 to over £200,000. In 1901, James Buchanan Duke's American Tobacco attempted to invade England. *Wills* led the counterattack which consisted, in part, of amalgamation of thirteen tobacco firms (including, besides his own, Players and Ogdens) to create Imperial Tobacco. *William Henry* assumed the helm, which he retained until his death. Also, in 1901, a truce was reached with Duke, and British-American Tobacco was formed. The Wills family was involved in Imperial and British-American for the next several generations.¹⁰³

The last of our 'sin' companies is Dewars. Our MP, *Arthur Dewar*, was not directly involved in management of the company although he had an interest in the company. His older brother, John, and younger, Tommy, ran the business, and brilliantly. John was the financial manager, Tommy the salesman. In 1880, when their father, founder of the business, died, profits were £1321. In twenty years they were £59,000, and a quarter of a century after that, when Distillers Ltd. was formed, Dewars own profits were £1,198,154. The later generations of Dewars continued to be involved and on the board, usually as chairman, until Distillers acquisition by Guinness in 1986.¹⁰⁴ Our MP, *Arthur*, was no slouch himself, becoming Solicitor General for Scotland in 1909 – 1910, and Senator of the College of Justice in Scotland as Lord Dewar from 1910 until his death in 1917.

There are two retailers which we will look at, Emerson M. Bainbridge (1817-1892), whose son, also *Emerson Muschap Bainbridge* (1846-1911), sat in our Parliament, and *Hudson Ewbanke Kearley*. The elder Bainbridge began his retail career in 1838 in a partnership with Alder Dunn selling woolen and linen drapery at fixed prices. Within a few years this partnership terminated and Bainbridge brought in a cousin as a partner and expanded his business, and by 1849, divided the floor space into departments. In 1855 he became sole owner, and ten years later built the company its own building. In 1898 the company's sales were almost £600,000. The company continued independently until 1952 when the John Lewis Partnership bought it.¹⁰⁵ Bainbridge's son (secondary education unknown, Durham University)

was in Parliament for the Gainsborough Division and personally was involved in collieries and a railway.

Hudson Ewbanke Kearley, the son of a self-employed plumber–contractor, was educated at local schools in Surrey.¹⁰⁶ At age fifteen he went to work for a coffee merchant, later moving to Tetley and Sons, Ltd., tea merchants. On the side, he would purchase tea in bulk from Tetley and sell it to shopkeepers whose sales were too small to order directly. Within a few years, with partners, he was opening shops of his own. ‘With a secure base Kearley could take advantage of the flood of cheap imported foodstuffs and expand both the range of produce sold and the number of retail outlets.’¹⁰⁷ The stores were called International Tea Company. Within forty years he had four hundred stores and had integrated backward from retail and wholesale to production and processing. He was active in politics and public service becoming the first Chairman of the Port of London Authority. In December, 1927, he sold his interest in the company for £4,000,000.

Two others need to be mentioned, one a solicitor and one an accountant. The solicitor, *Sir Robert William Perks, Baronet* (cr. 1908) (Lincolnshire - East Lindsay), was the elder son of Reverend George Thomas Perks, a Wesleyan minister and his wife, Mary, daughter of James A. Dodds, an architect, of Edinburgh. Educated at New Kingswood School, Bath, then secondarily at a private school in Clapham, he studied at Kings College, London. He was admitted as a solicitor in 1875 and in 1876 founded a firm with Henry Hartley Fowler, specializing in railway and parliamentary work. On a trip to North Wales he met by chance George Douglas-Pennant (see

above) and suggested a very successful way to privatize Conway bridge. Contacts made here blossomed. He worked with Lord Cranbrook on a dispute with the South Eastern Railway and so impressed SER's Chairman, Sir Edward Watkin, that Watkin hired him to help in a shareholder's election fight. Through Watkin, *Perks* met Thomas Walker, a contractor, for whom *Perks* subsequently would do the legal work. In 1879, Watkin asked *Perks* to become solicitor to the Metropolitan Railway, of which Watkin had been Chairman since 1872. *Perks*, who had just moved to larger quarters in Westminster, was reluctant to drop everything to become the Metropolitan's sole in-house attorney. But Watkin wanted him and a deal was struck, *Perks* opened a satellite office near Metropolitan's offices, staffed it, and checked it everyday. For the next twelve years *Perks* was legal counsel to Metropolitan and claimed to be the one who had the concept of separating the Metropolitan railway from its surplus lands which led eventually to the formation of the Metropolitan Estate and Property Corporation, Ltd.¹⁰⁸

In conjunction with Walker, *Perks* was also involved in tunnels, docks, canals, South American harbour works and railways. His father-in-law was a large holder in Metropolitan stock and in 1901 *Perks* became Chairman of the Metropolitan Railway. He was involved for the next seven years organizing the Underground Electric Railways Co. of London, Ltd. which in time would become the nucleus for the London Transport District. His son, who studied at Leys school, succeeded him as baronet, and later was head of a religious newspaper and of two contracting firms.

The other is William Quilter, son of Samuel Quilter, who seems to have been a farmer. William came to London in 1825 and was articled to Peter Harris Abbott one of the leading accountants of the time. Quilter and another associate of Abbott, John Ball, formed their own accounting firm when Abbott assumed the post of an Official Assignee in Bankruptcy in 1833. For the next fifty plus years Quilter's practice would grow, become an important auditing firm (auditing over 70 public firms and an unknown number of private ones at the time of Quilter's death), and then, in time be eclipsed. Eventually, thirty years after his death, the company was absorbed by Deloitte.¹⁰⁹ But Quilter's oldest son, *Sir William Cuthbert Quilter, Baronet*, privately educated, an MP in our Parliament (Suffolk - Sudbury), would not follow him into accounting, rather he went to the exchange, formed his own firm, Quilter, Balfour and Company, and was involved in the formation of United Telephone and Swan United Electric light.

A number of well known accountants came out of Quilter's firm. The Cooper brothers, whose firm would become Coopers and Lybrand; John Ball, nephew of Quilter's partner, John Ball, would go on to found his own firm Ball, Baker; and John Ellerman, whom we have met before as a buyer of shipping firms, also worked for Quilter for three years.

Perhaps, now that we have listed all that we are going to from this Parliament, it is best to deal here with John Ellerman.¹¹⁰ He is a striking example of an outsider who buys and builds, a roll-up artist. After his father's death when he was nine, his mother took him to France, then he attended the King Edward VI school in

Birmingham. He went to work as a bookkeeper and after passing his articles as an accountant moved to London. Offered a partnership by Quilter, he refused and opened his own practice. He then would set up investment trusts, buy companies with good products or equipment but which had managerial problems he could fix. His first trust purchased breweries, and within a few years had returned 1300 percent on the original investment. One of his first purchases in shipping was *Forward's* West India Line, in 1900, which Ellerman merged with Leyland Lines. These were sold to Morgan in 1902 with Ellerman supposedly netting about £2,000,000. Within a few years he was again buying shipping assets. He was created a baronet in 1905.

He was said to have stated that at one time in the nineteen-teens he believed he was worth, on paper, over fifty million pounds. The twenties and thirties were tougher, however, on wealth and when he died his estate was valued at £37,000,000, the largest estate ever in England up to that time. His son, Sir John Reeves Ellerman, Bt. succeeded him but had no children. He was not the businessman that his father was, his interests being more inclined to the academic, publishing articles on natural history. Though active in overseeing the activities of the company, he left management to professionals. When he died in 1973 his estate was valued at over £52,000,000. It was left to charity, the Moorgate Charitable Trust. The shipping lines were sold and today (summer of 2008) the Trust, renamed the John Ellerman Foundation manages more than £100,000,000 and gives away more than five percent a year.¹¹¹

To summarize what has come before: of our fourteen in finance, the traditional 'high street' banks, following the Barings Crisis, merged to broaden their domestic geographic footprint, to increase their capital base, and to gain the size necessary to compete internationally with large German and American banks, and two of the three investment banks, Gibbs and Montague were purchased by large financial institutions in the last third of the twentieth century. Also, Gibbs was successfully led and reoriented after the loss of its great guano monopoly by H. H. Gibbs, a Rugby boy who had attended the school when Dr. Arnold was there, and so had the closest connection to this supposedly ill conceived educational philosophy of anybody at whom we have looked. Rothschilds continues independently though it has a closer relation with its Parisian counterpart.

Stockbrokers and financiers are a personality based business and the real assets of the company can walk out the door or die. Thus, the companies can come and go. However, a successful financier will leave accumulated wealth for the benefit of those persons or institutions about which they care, and further, the physical assets of the companies which they successfully promote and develop, if well managed, can benefit their societies. In the cases of Henderson, Philipps, and Morrison, while they did not leave single, on going, businesses, many of the companies or assets of the companies may still provide benefits, and certainly their families benefitted financially. Banbury, Begg, and W. C. Quilter's brokerage firms are gone, but again the companies they promoted or their successors, in some cases, are still existent.

All of the seven companies in mines, iron, steel, and the royalties attached thereto were nationalized. Once government has bought out a business, it is hard to see how the previous ownership or their sons can be held responsible for the businesses' subsequent performance.

Of the ship yards of our seven MPs in this business, the shipbuilders consolidated, suffered between the wars as demand for shipping fell as international trade decreased. The surviving firms shuttered some yards and moved into other businesses, building smaller ships than before, specialized ships, and other products. Metal products producers adjusted. *Mappin's* two family firms, Mappin and Webb and Turton, continue separately today. Kenrick was led by a Rugby boy who reinvented the company after World War II and it is now a leading supplier of castors in the United Kingdom, as well as builder's hardware. G K N, lineal successor to Chamberlain's firm, exited screws and bolts in light of the government's inconsistent policies on steel nationalization, but now thrives as world leaders in powdered metals and in aerospace.

The shipping firms represented in this sample all sold out, three of the four during the First World War, two of the four ended up in Ellerman's hands. Ellerman is an example of someone from outside of a company, or even an industry, who is willing to buy on the speculation that he can reap a return by consolidating, merging, or, in other ways, rationalizing the operations of a firm. The existence of someone like him is not contemplated by Wiener's construct. It is also seen in this study that partners, rather than family members, can provide continuity to a firm. Harland and

Wolff and Quilter's father's accounting practice are two examples of this, and are another exception to Wiener's concept.

The textile business, often a first step for a society into large scale industrialization, in England consolidated from the 1870s on. By now, except for companies in the high end of the trade, it has largely left England and is often found in developing countries. (It has also largely retreated from the United States.) Since consolidation dilutes a founding family's control of a business, it is not clear how Wiener accounts for consolidation in his theory for the decline of British business

Two of our businesses were shut down almost immediately. One by succeeding family members, Aird's construction company, because of the inability of his sons to manage well (as well as their unwillingness to go out to Singapore to personally try to save the contract which was the company's undoing.) In the other case, that of Jackson's tannery, no one in the family wanted to follow him into the business and even a professional manager couldn't keep it alive. Tanning, after all, is an ancient, hard, and noxious business without great growth prospects. Letting it expire might very well have been the most rational decision. On the other hand, the other of our construction companies, Pearson's, has evolved from heavy construction to one of the world's largest publishers.

The chemical businesses which we looked at are characterized by mergers amongst the alkaline producers which leads to Imperial Chemicals. Fison, our other chemical company, thrived under the leadership of a Charterhouse and Oxford

educated family member, and only wound up being bought (and at that for nearly three billion dollars) after being managed by professionals.

Another public school boy (Rugby, Cambridge), Sir Harry Pilkington, led Pilkington's to significant growth and supported the development of what was probably the most significant advance in glass making in the last half of the twentieth century. One of his successors, the inventor, also came from a secondary school of ancient foundation. The success over the last fifty years led to the sale of the company for £2,200,000,000 net to the shareholders in 2006.

In the broad category of consumer goods, the ink company lasted until major changes in pen technology made their product obsolete. Spicer paper, Colman Company, Palmer's Biscuits, Watney Combe (now Watney Mann), and Dewars, are all still brand names being produced in the United Kingdom though the companies are no longer stand-alones. Spicer and Watney Combe were successfully led by public school graduates for several generations. Wills Tobacco, largely the basis of Imperial Tobacco, continues within Imperial and the Wills family has been involved for much of Imperial's history and have been involved as well in British American Tobacco. *William Henry Wills*, who led his family's tobacco company to great success, then fought off Duke by merging a host of British companies and ran the combine for a subsequent number of years, was a Mill Hill graduate.

Pender's telegraph companies were merged by government action with Marconi, but the family involvement continued over several generations. Perk's railways are the basis of London's Underground. The two retailers were successfully

sold, and one continues today as a division of a cooperative. The disposition of the other after the sale, I have not been able to discover. And finally, while Quilter's accounting firm changed names after his death, and merged with Deloitte's thirty years later, the real assets of the firm, its accountants, often founded other firms, headed the profession's institute, or, in the case of Ellerman, became a business phenomenon.

The common theme of all of the above is that the founding families usually seek to protect their assets by placing them in the strongest, and presumably, safest hands. This might mean inheritance and leadership by a scion of the family, it might mean merger with like firms, it might mean sale to the government (the financially strongest hands, though perhaps managerially weakest), another company, or another individual, such as an Ellerman, Philipps, or Morrison. It might mean shutting down if the conditions of their industry does not favor them. Galloways steam engines, for example, could not convert to making electrical motors, the technology is completely different. What we do not find in the above listing is continual failure by public school scions of entrepreneurial families. Indeed, we can often see successes by these public school educated businessmen.

Further, if we go outside of our limitation imposed by the Dictionary of Business Biography to look at other MPs and the companies: Dr. Arnold's grandson, Hugh Oakley Arnold-Forster, who attended Rugby and Oxford and became a lawyer, later became a successful book publisher. Book publishing is the combination of business with literature. He was a business success, not a failure either because of

genetics or education. In chapter two there was a listing of the insurance companies who had someone affiliated with them in the later of our two Parliaments. Most of the companies survive to today, either as subsidiaries of insurance conglomerates or still on their own. The breweries of fourteen of the sixteen brewers who were MPs as shown in chapter two survived either independently or through mergers. Four of five distillers discussed in chapter two sold out and the brands continued well into the twentieth century, Dewars being an example. The National Telephone Company was purchased by the Post Office, and as shown above, the international telegraph companies survive in Cable and Wireless. Muntz Metal is now a part of Imperial Chemical. And the railways, in many ways the catalyst for the English industrial revolution, were nationalized and then reprivatized.

Now we have not been able to investigate the education of the subsequent leadership of these companies, it is beyond the scope of this paper. However, D. C. Coleman, whom we have referenced before, had evidently previously written a study of Courtaulds which he references in his later paper 'Gentlemen and Players.' "In Courtaulds in the 1930's, for example, it was the 'practical men', at the board and managerial level, who were both the most stubborn opponents of the new ideas and scientific research and the least willing to recognize trades unions or the need for change in the face of labour unrest. It was the Public School-or university-educated leaders who showed initiative in bringing in scientist or in making organizational changes which the practical men opposed"¹² Obviously, if this were true for a significant percentage of British business it would do serious damage to Wiener's

thesis. For you see, we have one father of two of our MPs from the Parliament of 1895-1900, H. H. Gibbs, who attended Rugby while Dr. Arnold was Headmaster. If one were to get a full dose of Arnoldian influence, one would assume it would be while under direct tutelage of the good doctor, but Gibbs was instrumental in leading his company to sizeable profits after the loss of their monopoly. Exactly the form of business leadership which Wiener lamented was lacking in the late twentieth century.

We have Dr. Arnold's grandson, a graduate of Rugby, who was a successful businessman at the turn of the century. We have Spicer's leadership of his family's companies, we have Will's embrace of the technology of finished cigarettes and willingness to face Duke head-on by merging with local competitors. We have Professor Coleman's description above which supports the idea that public school boys were not oblivious to the business challenges which they faced in the 1930s. We have in Fisons, Pilkingtons, and Kenricks, three industrial companies successfully led by public school educated scions of their founding families. Indeed, it was the professional management which led to the sale of Fisons while under pressure, and to the sale of Pilkington's while in a strong equity market. Kenricks has continued in its own successful course. How we could have these successes throughout the second half of the nineteenth century and most of the twentieth, only to be offset by troubles in the nineteen-sixties and seventies and then attempt to lay the blame for these troubles of about twenty years at the feet of a headmaster who had been dead nearly one and a third centuries, is, I think, a bit excessive.

Finally, most seem to accept the idea that businessmen when they were successful sent their sons to the best public school they could. They have been accused of mimicking their social betters by this action. Perhaps, though if the public schools were considered the best available then were they not just guilty of trying to do the best for their children that they could? But further, we have found that those who subsequently were in government, land holders, military, and barristers (long-standing forms of income production and parts of the traditional hierarchy) in both our Parliaments had a high relative proportion attending these schools, and that bankers, financiers, brewers also had a high proportion. These later three were old and profitable businesses. Further, we found that many of the Members of Parliament from other industries such as wool, cotton, and collieries had either no or very low attendance rates among the mid-century MPs and low rates among those in the later Parliament. Further, steel producers had a relatively modest rate which, while it nearly doubled in the last half of the century, was still only about 40% of the rate of bankers, and brewers and about half the rate among financiers. Railways were a new business but had a large number of public school graduates involved. This might be explainable by the sheer size of the companies relative to almost any other business (a lot of money is flowing through these businesses), and the railroads probably had high profitability. In light of the above list, is it not possible that attendance at public school is more appropriately viewed as an indicator of an old and/or profitable income generating profession or source? Maybe it is a combination of time and profit which leads to attendance by sons at public schools. The industries which had

problems in the twentieth century, cloth, iron and steel, ship building, for the most part, had low public school attendance and were not businesses of great antiquity or necessarily high and sustainable profitability. Thus, public school attendance might actually be more accurately viewed as a proxy for the determination of the most successful longstanding businesses.

In conclusion, Wiener has argued that the economic problems of the United Kingdom in the second half of the twentieth century occurred against a backdrop of anti-capitalist sentiment that evolved over the course of the second half of the nineteenth century. This arose from religious and social scruples and from an intellectual reaction to the worst abuses of unfettered laissez-faire capitalism. This growing disdain for business was inculcated into the entrepreneurial industrial class because those successful fathers sent their sons to public schools where this anti-capitalist philosophy permeated the curriculum and culture.

What we have found in our blindly chosen sample is that at the end of the nineteenth century those types of business which had been most closely connected to the public schools were the older lines of business such as banking, finance, distilling, and brewing. Many of these companies continue today, sometimes as a stand alone, more often as part of a merger. Other companies in coal, iron and steel, and shipbuilding, those the decline of which Wiener lamented, were nationalized and in many cases are now folded. Further, taking as a sample those businessmen (and their businesses) who are Members of Parliament in the Parliament of 1895-1900 and who have listings in the Dictionary of Business Biography, we find most of the companies

across all lines of business were merged or sold by the founding family or owners in an effort to preserve the owner's wealth and to allow the company's operations to continue. In the case where the company was one in which the family retained control, we often find public school boys doing a creditable, if not on occasion brilliant, job of protecting, changing and expanding the company in their charge. While some might argue that the evidence I have presented here is limited and therefore inconclusive, I believe that the evidence we have found here clearly does not support Wiener's argument that the ill-education at public schools of the sons of England's nineteenth century businessmen was what led to the decline of England's economic fortunes, especially in the last third of the twentieth century. I think that we have found numerous examples where companies and their owners found solutions to the continuance of a company either through merger, promotion of non-family members, or the emergence of a family member, often educated at a public school, who guided his company successfully.

One final note. Wiener claims that from mid-century the English Universities also "witnessed a 'conservative revolution. . . In the eighteen-fifties and sixties, 'modern' subjects were scarcely in evidence in the Oxbridge curriculum."¹¹³ However, at Cambridge the curriculum was reorganized with a new Natural Sciences Tripos beginning in 1851. Granted, this was an entirely theoretically based program, there as yet being no experimental labs at the University, but within twenty years,

both Oxford and Cambridge built experimental labs; Oxford's being the Clarendon and Cambridge's the famous Cavendish.

If Wiener is correct about a southern, aristocratic ethos, then these labs themselves are a problem for his theory. Oxford's Clarendon Lab was financed by the estate of the Earl of Clarendon and the Cavendish, named for 18th century scientist, Henry Cavendish (discoverer of hydrogen and many other laws and principles subsequently discovered by or credited to others), a Cambridge man, was paid for by Cavendish's cousin, the then current Chancellor of the University, the seventh Duke of Devonshire.

Were these labs (as well as those at other U.K. universities: Glasgow (where Lord Kelvin had installed the first university research lab in Great Britain in the 1840s), Edinburgh, London, and the civic universities) successful in developing research science in England? Since 1901, the Nobel Committee has been awarding prizes for groundbreaking discoveries in three scientific fields: Physics, Chemistry, and Physiology or Medicine. These awards can be used as an indicator of the relative strength and importance of different nation's scientific output. In the first fifty years (1901-1950) the number of laureates in these three categories by nationality were (Table 93):

Table 93
Nobel Prizes awarded in the Three Scientific Categories
by Nationality of the Receiptent 1901-1950

Discipline	Germ.	U.K.	U.S.A.	Fr.	Neth.	Switz.	Swed.	Russia	Japan	Other
Physics	10	13	9	6	4	2	2	0	1	7
Chemistry	18	7	7	5	2	3	4	0	0	4
Medicine	9	9	12	4	2	4	1	2	0	13
Total	37	29	28	15	8	9	7	2	1	24

[Source: Data for 1901-2007, the Encyclopedia Britannica.]

While the Germans had significantly more laureates than any other country, this was concentrated in chemistry, an area in which they were long known for their superiority. The British had more physics laureates than any other country, while the Americans excelled in medicine. Over this period, the British were never lower than second in any of these three disciplines.

In the subsequent period of thirty years (1951-1980), up to the time of Wiener's book, an era dominated by the United States, we find (Table 94):

Table 94
Nobel Prizes awarded in the Three Scientific Categories
By Nationality of the Receiptent 1951-1980

Discipline	Germ.	U.K.	U.S.A.	Fr.	Neth.	Switz.	Swed.	Russia	Japan	Other
Physics	3	7	34	2	1	0	1	7	2	6
Chemistry	5	15	17	0	0	1	0	1	0	6
Medicine	2	10	43	4	0	1	3	0	0	5
Total	10	32	94	6	1	2	4	8	2	17

[Source: Data for 1901-2007, the Encyclopedia Britannica.]

What is remarkable, besides the domination of the United States, is that in these thirty years scientists from the UK were awarded three more Nobel laureates than during the previous fifty years. Only the US and the USSR (which, as Russia,

had two in the first fifty years) had any significant percentage increase in the number of Nobels in excess of Britain's. If, as Wiener suggests, since the nineteenth century the United Kingdom has had disdained science as much as he implies, from whence do these results come?

If one consolidates the data - Table 95 shows the first eighty years of the Nobel prizes:

Table 95
Nobel Prizes awarded in the Three Scientific Categories
By Nationality of the Receiptient 1901-1980

Discipline	Germ.	U.K.	U.S.A.	Fr.	Neth.	Switz.	Swed.	Russia	Japan	Other
Physics	13	20	43	8	5	2	3	7	3	13
Chemistry	23	22	24	5	2	4	4	1	0	10
Medicine	11	19	55	8	2	5	4	2	0	18
Total	47	61	122	21	9	11	11	10	3	41

[Source: Data for 1901-2007, the Encyclopedia Britannica.]

The United States clearly dominated, overwhelmingly in medicine, significantly in physics, but was almost in a three way tie with Germany and Britain in chemistry. Britain's awards were almost equal across the three disciplines, and at half of the American's awards, while having but between one third and one fifth the population and a significantly smaller economy, would make one hard pressed to find any evidence here of an British anti-scientific bent. Indeed, these results might lead one to say that the British had been hitting well above their weight.

However, Table 96 dispays the results since Wiener's book was published in 1981:

Table 96
Nobel Prizes awarded in the Three Scientific Categories
By Nationality of the Receptient 1981-2008

Discipline	Germ.	U.K.	U.S.A.	Fr.	Neth.	Switz.	Swed.	Russia	Japan	Other
Physics	9	0	40	4	3	2	1	2	3	5
Chemistry	4	4	35	2	1	2	0	0	5	6
Medicine	5	10	35	2	0	1	3	0	1	6
Total	18	14	110	8	4	5	4	2	9	17

(Of all of the 'Other' category, 1901-2008: Denmark – 9, Austria - 8, Italy – 7, Canada - 6, Australia - 4, Belgium – 4 and 14 other nations with none holding more than two.)

[Source: Data for 1901-2007, the Encyclopedia Britannica; for 2008, International Herald Tribune, 13 October 2008.]

While compared to anyone other than the United States and Germany (both of whose scientists received Nobel's at rates greater than the previous thirty years), the UK is doing well, nevertheless, by the last fifth of the twentieth century and well into the twenty-first the UK is running at about half the success rate as it did during the previous thirty year period (Table 94), while the remainder of the world is receiving Nobels at about the same rate as in the previous period (with Russia dropping more than the UK, but with Japan and 'Other' partly making up for this drop off.) Note also the complete disappearance of British awards in the physics category. The question then becomes, why? Is this a result of relative impoverishment? Is this a result of a modern non-scientific bent? Is it just the result of the by now total domination by the United States? Or might this be the result of the British government and/or society reacting to the arguments made, at least in part, by Wiener? While the rising success of Japan might indicate that it may be at least partly a function of wealth; if the British government after 1980, in reaction to the worry that enough science was not taught at the secondary level, failed to

sufficiently support science at the highest level, then perhaps Wiener, or at least his argument, deserves some blame.

ENDNOTES

Introduction

1. *Times*, (London) 2 May 1851.
2. Derek Beales, From Castlereagh to Gladstone, 1815-1885 New York: W. W. Norton, 1969, 295.
3. B. R. Mitchell, British Historical Statistics Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988, 822.
4. François Bedarida, A Social History of England trans. A. S. Forster, New York: Routledge, 1991, 16-17.
5. Harold Perkin, The Origins of Modern English Society London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969, 271-272.
6. Perry Anderson and Robin Blackburn, ed. Towards Socialism Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1966; Tom Nairn, The Breakup of Britain London: NLB, 1977.
7. Nairn, 32.
8. Martin J. Wiener, English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit, 1851-1980 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981, 127.
9. R. H. S. Crossmen, 'Introduction,' in Walter Bagehot, The English Constitution, Cornell University Press, 1963, 1-57, especially pp. 14-22, and 26-37.
10. Walter Bagehot, The English Constitution, Cornell University Press, 1963, 210.
11. Patrick Joyce, Work, Society, and Politics, The culture of the factory in late Victorian England, Rutgers University Press, 1980.
12. W. O. Aydelotte, *History*, Volume 39, no. 137, October 1954, 249-262.
13. _____, Aydelotte, Quantification in History, Addison Wesley, Reading, MA., 1971, Chapter 5.
14. _____, 'Voting Pattern in the House of Commons,' in W. O. Aydelotte, ed. The History of Parliamentary Behavior, Princeton, 1972, chapter 7.
15. W. D. Rubinstein, Capitalism, Culture, and Decline in Britain, 1750-1990, Routledge, London and New York, 1993.

Chapter One

1. Chris Cook and Brendan Keith, British Historical Facts, 1830-1900, New York: 1975, 116.
2. Cook and Keith, p. 133.
3. Norman Gash, Aristocracy and People, Britain, 1815-1865 Cambridge, MA. 1979, 158.
4. Gash, 242-244.
5. Beales, 78.
6. Gash, 45-47.
7. Gash, 156.
8. Robert Dod, The Parliamentary Companion, 1852-1857, London: 1852-1857, reprint, Washington, D. C: Microfiche Editions, Inc. 1965; L. G. Pine, ed. Burkes Peerage, Baronetage, & Knightage, London: 1953; Peter Townsend, ed. Burkes Landed Gentry, London: 1969; Frederick Boase, ed., Modern English Biography 1851-1900 (1892) reprint, New York: 1965; Sir Leslie Stephan and Sir Sidney Lee, eds., The Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford: 1921-1922 (herein after, DNB); Henry Boylan, A Dictionary Of Irish Biography, London: 1978; John Bateman, The Great Landholders of Great Britain and Ireland, London: 1883, reprint, New York: 1970; Paul Sieveking, ed., British Bibliographical Archive, 17th through 19th Centuries, A One Alphabet Cumulation of 324 of the Most Important English Language Biographical Reference Works Originally Published Between 1601 and 1929, Munich: c. 1984, and D. J. Jeremy and Christine Shaw, eds., Dictionary of Business Biography: A Biographical Dictionary of Business Leaders Active in Britain in the Period 1860-1980, five volumes and one supplement, London: 1984-1986 (herein after DBB).
9. DNB; Sieveking
10. Hansard, 24, July 1855, debate on Partnership Amendment Bill.
11. Hansard.
12. Hansard.
13. Hansard.
14. Hansard.
15. W. O. Aydelotte, 'The House of Commons in the 1840's', *History* 39, no. 137, October 1954, 249-262.

16. Philip Lawson, The East India Company, A History, New York, 1993, 156-158.
17. DNB; Sieveking.
18. DNB; Sieveking.
19. DNB; Sieveking.
20. DNB; Sieveking.
21. <<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Whites>>; <<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Brooks>>; <<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Boodles>>; <<http://www.victorianlondon.org/entertainment/alfredclub.htm>>; <[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gentlemen'sclub \(traditional\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gentlemen'sclub_(traditional))>
22. <<http://www.oxfordandcambridgeclub.co.uk/en/about-us/history/>>
23. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Athenaeum_Club>; <<http://www.athenaeumclub.co.uk>>
24. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Travelers_Club>; <<http://www.thetravelersclub.org.uk/>>
25. <<http://www.bluffton.edu/~sullivanm/England/London/clubsintro/intro.html>>; <<http://www.armynavyclub.co.uk/the-club/club-history.php>>; <<http://www.navalandmilitaryclub.co.uk/club/index.php>>
26. <<http://www.carltonclub.co.uk/index.asp>>; <<http://www.reformclub.com/>>
27. John R. H. Moorman, A History of the Church in England, Harrisburg, PA: 1994, pp. 330-331.
28. Moorman, 336.
29. See Peter B. Nockles, The Oxford Movement in Context, Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760-1857, Cambridge: 1994.
30. Sheridan Gilley and W. J. Sheils, A History of Religion in Britain, Practice & Belief from the Pre-Roman Times to the Present, Cambridge, MA: 1994, Chapter 18, especially pp. 354-357.
31. <<http://www.nuim.ie/about/history.shtm>>; <http://www.victorianweb.org/religion/maynooth_Grant.html>
32. <<http://www.rothschildarchive.org/ib/?doc=/ib/articles/BW4aTimeline>>
33. Dods, 1852, 129.

34. Dods, 200.
35. Dods, 278.
36. Dods, 131.
37. Dods, 185.
38. DNB.
39. James A. Moncuse, "James Wilson and the Economist." Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, New York, 1960, 24-27.
40. DNB.
41. House of Commons, Division Lists (London: F. W. Tarrington, 1852-1857; Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, Ltd. 1982, microfiche.
42. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, third series, volumes CXXIII to CXLIV, London: 1826-1858.
43. Regarding the front-benchers of the opposition, it has been argued that the concept of a shadow cabinet came later than the time of this Parliament. D. R. Turner, however, in his book The Shadow Cabinet in British Politics (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969, 9-10, has shown that in the period of 1852-1855 Disraeli several times referred to a Conservative cabinet, and attended at least one meeting, on 10 December 1853 at Knowsley Park, of a 'cabinet council'. By 1856, Sir William G. H. Jolliffe, the Conservative chief whip, wrote of meetings of 'small cabinets', and on 7 May 1857 a group of Conservative leaders met to discuss the Queen's speech. While an organized opposition shadow cabinet may not have existed by this time, clearly there were certain Conservative members who, with an accumulation of knowledge on different subjects, represented the Conservative Party. For purposes of this part of this paper, I have used the members of the Conservative government of late 1852 to early 1853 as the members for the opposition front-benchers during the later liberal governments of this Parliament.
44. Alex S. Rosser, "Businessmen in the House of Commons: Key Players or Mere Spectators." Master's Thesis, University of Missouri – Kansas City, 1996, Appendix.
45. G. R. Searle, Entrepreneurial Politics in Mid-Victorian Britain, Oxford: 1993, 187-193.
46. Subjects which were heavily discussed (over 250 column inches) and were of importance to businessmen included the 'Post', 'hours of Parliamentary sittings', 'expulsion or vacation of seats', 'points of personal privilege in Commons', and 'urban sewerage and drainage'.

47. British Sessional Papers, Reports of Committees, 1852-1857, ed. Edgar L. Erickson, Chairman, Special Committee on British Sessional Papers of the American Historical Association (n. p. Readex Microprint Editions, n. d.).
48. Not including witnesses before election committees because they are not usually identified by full time vocations when testifying about alleged election law violations.
49. British Sessional Papers, Public Bills, 1852-1857, ed. Edgar L. Erickson, Chairman, Special Committee on British Sessional Papers of the American Historical Association, (n. p. Readex Microprint Editions, n. d.).

Chapter Two

1. Dod's, 1895-1900.
2. Oscar Wilde, 'The Importance of Being Earnest', Act 1, Scene 2.
3. Unless otherwise noted, all landholdings in this chapter will be from John Bateman's The Great Landowners of Great Britain and Ireland. London: privately printed, 1883; reprint, New York: Augustus M. Kelley Publishers, 1970.
4. George J. Goschen, The Theory of the Foreign Exchanges, London: Effingham Wilson & Co., 1890, 14th Edition. This edition is available in digitized form through Microsoft. Currently there is also a paperback reprint edition available.
5. Blanche E. C. Dugdale, Arthur James Balfour, First Earl of Balfour, K.G., O.M., F.R.S. Etc., New York: 1937.
6. For further information: Azar Gat, A History of Military Thought: From the Enlightenment to the Cold War, Oxford UP, 2001, 473-479.
7. <<http://www.victoriacross.org.uk/bbhallan.htm>>
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sir_Henry_Havelock-Allan,_1st_Baronet>
8. <<http://graysinn.info>>; <<http://www.lincolnsinn.org.uk/>>;
<<http://www.innertemple.org.uk/>>; <<http://www.middletemple.org.uk/>>;
<http://www.advocates.org.uk/>>; <<http://www.kingsinns.ie/website/index.htm>>
9. DNB, 1922-1930 supplement, London, New York, Oxford University Press, 1937, 393.
10. DNB, 1912-1921 supplement, London, New York, Oxford University Press, 1927, 473.
11. H. F. Oxbury, ed., the Concise Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford: 1982, 65.

12. <<http://www.fundinguniverse.com/company-histories/COMMERCIAL-UNION-PLC-Company-History.html>>
13. <<http://www.fundinguniverse.com/company-histories/Royal-amp;-Sun-Alliance-Insurance-Group-plc-Company-History.html>>
14. DNB, 1931-1940 supplement, London, Oxford University Press, G. Cumberledge, 1949, 21.
15. Oxbury, p. 82.
16. <<http://portcities.hartlepool.gov.uk/server.php?show=ConNarrative.52>>
17. <http://rememberwhen.gazettelive.co.uk/2008/04/head_wrightson.html>
18. <<http://dalmarnock.eveningtimes.co.uk/area/sir-william-arrol.html>>;
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sir_William_Arrol_%26_Co.>;
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Clarke_Chapman>;
<http://www.langleyholdings.com/site/2/Home.asp?nav_id=245>
19. <http://www.experiencefestival.com/a/Cable_amp_Wireless_-_History/id/621518>
20. DNB, 1941-1950 supplement, London, Oxford University Press, 1959, 108.
21. <<http://web.ukonline.co.uk/freshwater/histuk.htm>>
22. <<http://www.midlandspubs.co.uk/worcestershire/oldbury.htm>>;
<<http://www.madeinbirmingham.org/ansells.htm>>;
<<http://www.breweryhistory.com/journal/archive/112/bh-112049.html>>
<<http://www.histman.co.uk/brewers/pages/L&Rbrewing.html>>
23. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Watney_Combe_&_Reid and <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=22279>>
24. <<http://www.breweryhistory.com/Defunct/LondonNorth.htm>>
25. <<http://stonch.blogspot.com/2007/10/vaux-of-sunderland.html>>;
<http://www.breweryarts.co.uk/about_us/>;
<<http://www.ukbusinesspark.co.uk/man66748.htm>>
26. <<http://www.scottish-newcastle.com/othersnukbrands.aspx>>
27. <<http://www.boydharris.co.uk/wlw017.htm>>;
<http://www.mmc.gov.uk/rep_pub/reports/1985/fulltext/193c04.pdf>
28. <<http://www.suffolkcamra.co.uk/pubs/brewery/141> >
29. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Seager_Evans_and_Co.>;
<http://www.glenugie.nl/pageID_6240395.html>
30. <<http://www.irishdistillers.com/about/historyofIrishDistillers.shtml> >

31. Their records are located with those of the mile-end distillery and can be found:
http://historyofalcoholanddrugs.typepad.com/alcohol_and_drugs_history/2008/05/allied-brewery.html
32. <<http://www.honours.gov.uk/>>
33. Howard Payn, The Merchandise Marks Act of 1887, etc. London: Stevens and Sons, 1888;
<www.wipo.int/treaties/en/ip/paris/>;
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paris_Convention_for_the_Protection_of_Industrial_Property>
34. Hansard, questions, 20 March 1896.
35. Hansard, questions, 6 August 1896.
36. Hansard, Answer to Queens Speech, 25 January 1897.
37. Hansard, questions, 16 February 1897, and
38. Hansard, Supply, Class II, Board of Trade funding, 23 August 1895 and Ibid, Answer to Queen's Speech, 18 February 1896.
39. British Sessional Papers, Parliament of 1895-1900.
40. British Sessional Papers, Parliament of 1895-1900.
41. British Sessional Papers, Parliament of 1895-1900.
42. British Sessional Papers, Parliament of 1895-1900.
43. British Sessional Papers, Parliament of 1895-1900.
44. Hansard: 13 May 1897, Millbank System, ss. 395-446.
45. Hansard, ss. 403.
46. Hansard, ss. 404-405.
47. Hansard, ss. 405-406.
48. Hansard, ss. 442.
49. British Sessional Papers, Parliament of 1895-1900.
50. Hansard, 20 July 1897, ss. 576-583 and 3 August 1897, ss. 292.
51. Hansard, 31 March 1896, ss. 526-580, further in 1896: 23 April, ss. 1521, 1522-1523, 1529; 27 April, ss. 174; 30 April 202-203, 212-213; 4 May ss. 436-437; 5 May, 555-646; 6 May, ss. 675-716; 7 May, ss. 739-740, 744-745, 756-832; 8 May, ss. 880-881; 11 May ss. 999, 1001, 1003-1004, 1012-1013, 1017-1099; 12 May ss. 1146-1147, 1147-1148; 13 May ss. 1261; 14 May, ss. 1321-1322, 1340-1341; 15 May ss.

- 1435-1436; 18 May, ss. 1565-1566, 1569-1570; 21 May, ss. 76-77, 83-84; 2 June, ss. 293; 4 June, ss. 425; 11 June ss. 861, 862, 863-929; 12 June ss. 957, 958; 15 June, ss. 1074-1103, 1103-1145; 16 June, ss. 1163, 1165-1242; 17 June, ss. 1246-1296; 18 June, ss. 1337-1338, 1342-1414; 19 June, ss. 1447; 22 June, ss. 1570, 1571-1612.
52. The Encyclopedia Britannica, eleventh edition, Cambridge: 1910, volume 9, 356-361; <http://www.kevinboone.com/lawglos_DoctrineOfCommonEmployment.html>
 53. Hansard: 2 February 1893, ss. 353; further in 1893: 20 February, ss. 1943-1972; 24 March, ss. 1052-1085; 25 April, ss. 1176-1223; 2 May, ss. 1833-1836; 5 May, ss. 208-225.
 54. Hansard, 20 February, ss. 1961.
 55. Hansard, 20 February 1894, ss. 851-899.
 56. Hansard: 3 May, 1897, ss. 1421-1492; further in 1897: 10 May, ss. 107; 17 May, ss. 623-624, 636-712; 18 May, ss. 733, 734-814; 20 May, ss. 932-933; 24 May, ss. 1151-1212; 25 May, ss. 1273-1342; 26 May, 1346-1393; 27 May ss. 1432, 1433-1485; 31 May, ss. 1638-1705; 1 June, ss. 32-94; 2 June, ss. 97-142; 3 June, ss. 177-178; 3 June, ss. 205-251; 4 June, ss. 269-280; 5 July, ss. 1127-1184; 6 July, ss. 1225-1293; 8 July, ss. 1350-1351, 1369-1433; 12 July, ss. 1604-1675; 13 July, ss. 30-40; 15 July, ss. 201-262; 30 July, ss. 1626-1687, 1688; 3 August 1897, ss. 291-292.
 57. Hansard, 17 May, ss. 653-655
 58. Hansard, ss. 667-670.
 59. Hansard, 18 May, ss. 741-747.

Chapter 3

1. James Cook Hamilton, "Parties and Voting Patterns in the Parliament of 1874-1880." Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Iowa, 1968.
2. William C. Lubenow, Parliamentary Politics and the Home Rule Crisis, (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1988.)
3. Lubenow., 318.
4. Perkin, 77. In The Origins of Modern English Society, Perkin discusses the Marquess of Stafford ending his opposition to the Liverpool and Manchester Railway for the right to appoint three directors. Thus the seeming attractiveness of railways to the well educated might actually be a reflection of noble rent gathering.
5. Perkin, 272.
6. Perkin, 271.

Chapter Four

1. Martin J. Wiener, English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit, 1850-1980. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990, p. 83.
2. Wiener, 99-100.
3. Wiener, 101
4. David Ward, 'The Public Schools and Industry in Britain after 1870', Journal of Contemporary History, Vol 11, 1967.
5. D. C. Coleman, 'Gentlemen and Players', Economic History Review, second series XXVI, 1973.
6. D. H. Aldcroft, 'The Entrepreneur and the British Economy, 1840-1914', Economic History Review, XVII, 1964.
7. Coleman, 102.
8. Coleman, 103.
9. Coleman, 104.
10. Correlli Barnett, The Audit of War, 1986.
11. P. Temin, 'The Relative Decline of the British Steel Industry, 1880-1913', in H. Rosovsky, ed. Industrialization in Two Systems, New York, Wiley, 1966, 140-155.
12. Michael Sanderson, 'Education and economic decline', in Dormois and Dintenfass, eds., The British Industrial Decline, London, Routledge, 1999, 159.
13. W. D. Rubinstein, Capitalism, Culture and Decline in Britain, 1750-1990, London, Routledge, 1991.
14. Robert Millward, 'Industry and Infrastructure', in Dormois and Dintenfass, eds., The British Industrial Decline, 54.
15. DBB, 1: 144-145.
16. DBB, 249-250.
17. DBB, 3: 153-158.
18. DBB, 1: 360-362.
19. DBB, 3: 360-362.
20. DBB, 1: 169-171.
21. DBB, 237-239.

- 22 DBB, 557-559.
- 23 <<http://www.aboutbarclays.com/content/detail.asp?NewsAreaID=138>> I have an older printout of a previous Barclays website listing all of the constituent banks, which, unfortunately, seems to be unavailable today.
- 24 <<http://www.fundinguniverse.com/company-histories/NATIONAL-WESTMINSTER-BANK-PLC-Company-History.html>>;
<<http://www.coutts.com/history/index.asp>>
- 25 DBB, 4: 946-952.
- 26 DBB, 1: 298-301.
- 27 DBB, 2: 548-553.
- 28 <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Midland_Bank>, by redirection from Midland Bank, plc.
- 29 <http://www.insurancebrokers.hsbc.com/public/hibl/pdfs/hibl/en/broking_matters_issue30.pdf>
- 30 DBB, 4: 341-345.
- 31 DBB, 4: 662-667. See also 668-670, and 670-675.
- 32 DBB, 1: 355-357.
- 33 DBB, 3: 521-523.
- 34 DBB, 5: 473-480.
- 35 DBB, 3: 209-216.
- 36 DBB, 3: 142-148.
- 37 DBB, 4: 597-601.
- 38 DBB, 1: 116-118.
- 39 DBB, 2: 146-151.
- 40 DBB, 147.
- 41 DBB, 4: 515-521.
- 42 DBB, 1: 860.
- 43 <<http://www.archiveshub.ac.uk/news/02102501.html>>;
<<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vickers-Armstrongs>>;
<<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vickers>>

44 DBB, 4: 57-61, and <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Brown_&_Company>
45 DBB, 3: 36-41.
46 DBB, 5: 854-859.
47 DBB, 856-857.
48 DBB, 2: 165-169.
49 DBB, 166.
50 DBB, 465-467.
51 DBB, 3: 598-602.
52 DBB, 598.
53 <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kitson_&_Co.>
54 DBB, 1: 869-872.
55 DBB, 3: 369-372.
56 <http://www.oceanlinermuseum.co.uk/Clan%20Line%20History.html>
57 DBB, 4: 837-841.
58 DBB, 4: 978-982.
59 Townsend, 2319.
60 DBB, 5: 846-849.
61 DBB, 2: 398-403.
62 DBB, 3: 299-303.
63 DBB, 4: 380-385.
64 DBB, 484-487.
65 <<http://www.johnfosterdirect.com/john-foster/>>
66 DBB, 4: 319-323.
67 <<http://www.knittingtogether.org.uk/doc.asp?doc=7380&cat=744>>
68 DBB, 3: 359-369.
69 DBB, 303-307.
70 DBB, 99-105.

71 <<http://www.nationmaster.com/encyclopedia/Fine-Spinners-and-Doublers>>
72 DBB, 4: 115-118.
73 DBB, 115;
<<http://www.mappin-and-webb.co.uk/history1.html>>
74 DBB, 4: 116
75 <<http://www.infomine.com/suppliers/contactstandard.asp?id=13105>>
76 DBB, 3: 586-588.
77 <<http://www.kenricks.co.uk/>>
78 DBB, 4: 643-648.
79 <<http://www.gkn.co.uk/Groupoverview/History.asp>>
80 DBB, 1: 17-19.
81 Ibid, v. 4, 582-594.
82 <<http://www.pearson.com/index.cfm?pageid=14>>
83 Ibid, and
DBB, 4: 133-135.
84 DBB, v. 1, 39-42.
85 DBB, 484-486.
86 Rennison, 41.
87 Rennison; DBB, 4: 486.
88 <<http://www.fundinguniverse.com/company-histories/Fisons-plc-Company-History.html>>
89 DBB, 2: 367-369.
90 <<http://www.fundinguniverse.com/company-histories/Fisons-plc-Company-History.html>>
91 DBB, 4: 693-699.
92 <<http://www.pilkington.com/pilkington-information/about+pilkington/education/sir+alastair+pilkington.htm>>
93 <<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pilkington>>
94 DBB, 5: 296-298.

- 95 DBB, 242-247.
- 96 DBB, 4: 609-613.
- 97 Townsend, 2093-2094.
- 98 DBB, 3: 468-470.
- 99 DBB, 5: 875-878.
- 100 DBB, 1: 750-752.
- 101 DBB, 4: 521-525.
- 102 DBB, 1: 372-374; Townsend, 301.
- 103 DBB, 5: 843-845.
- 104 DBB, 2: 94-96.
- 105 DBB, 1: 102-104.
- 106 DBB, 3: 561-564.
- 107 DBB, 562.
- 108 DBB, 4: 628-632.
- 109 DBB, 791-795.
- 110 DBB, 2: 248-261.
- 111 <<http://www.ellerman.org.uk/>>
- 112 Coleman, 113.
- 113 Wiener, 22.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Government Documents

- Erickson, Edgar L., ed., British Sessional Papers, Public Bills, 1852-57, and British Sessional Papers, Public Bills, 1895-1900. Special Committee on British Sessional Papers of the American Historical Association. n.p: Readex Microprint Editions. n. d.
- Erickson, Edgar L. ed. British Sessional Papers, Reports of Committees, 1852-1857, and British Sessional Papers, Reports of Committees, 1895-1900. Special Committee on British Sessional Papers of the American Historical Association. N. p: Readex Microprint Editions. n.d.
- Hansard. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates. Third Series. Volumes 123-144. London: Cornelius Buck et al., 1852 to 1857.
- Hansard. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates 1895 to 1900. Millbanksystems: <<http://hansard.millbanksystems.com>>
- House of Commons. Division Lists. London: F. W. Tarrington, 1852-1857. Cambridge: Chadwyck Healey, Ltd. 1982.

Works of Reference

- Dod, Robert. The Parliamentary Companion, 1852-1857, and 1895-1900. London: Whitaker and Company, 1852-1857, 1895-1900; reprint, Washington, D. C. Microfiche Editions, Inc. 1965.
- The Encyclopedia Britannica, eleventh edition, Cambridge: 1910

Secondary Sources

Works of Reference

- Bateman, John. The Great Landowners of Great Britain and Ireland. London: privately printed, 1883; reprint, New York: Augustus M. Kelley Publishers, 1970.
- Boase, Frederick. Modern English Biography. Cornwall: privately printed, 1982; reprint, New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc. 1965.
- Boylan, Henry. A Dictionary of Irish Biography. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1978.

- Chandler, Alfred D., Jr. Scale and Scope: The Dynamics of Industrial Capitalism. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1990.
- Cook, Chris and Brendan Keith. British Historical Facts, 1830-1900. New York: St. Martins Press, 1975.
- Jeremy, David J. and Christine Shaw. Dictionary of Business Biography: A Biographical Dictionary of Business Leaders Active in Britain in the Period 1860-1980. London: Butterworths, 1984.
- Mitchell, B. R. British Historical Statistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Oxbury, H. F. ed., The Concise Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford: Oxford UP, 1982.
- Howard Payn, The Merchandise Marks Act of 1887, etc. London: Stevens and Sons, 1888.
- Pine, L. G. ed. Burkes Peerage, Baronetage, and Knightage. London: Burkes Peerage, Ltd., 1953.
- Sieveking, Paul, ed. British Biographical Archive, 17th through 19th Centuries. A One Alphabet Cumulation of 324 of the Most Important English Language Biographical Reference Works Originally Published Between 1601 and 1929. Munich: K. G. Saur, 1984.
- Slaven, Anthony and Sydney Checkland, et al, eds., Dictionary of Scottish Business Biography, 1860-1960. Aberdeen University Press, Aberdeen, Scotland, 1986.
- Stephen, Sir Leslie, and Sir Sidney Lee, Eds. The Dictionary of National Biography. London: Oxford University Press and Humphrey Milford, 1921.
- Townsend, Peter, ed. Burkes Landed Gentry, 18th edition. London: Burke's Peerage Ltd., 1969.
- _____. Burkes Peerage and Baronetage. London: Burkes Peerage Ltd. 1975.

Books

- Alford, B. W. E. Britain in the World Economy Since 1880. New York: Longman, 1996.
- Aydelotte, W. O., and Allan G. Bogue. The Dimension of Quantitative Research in History. Princeton, N. J: R. W. Fogel, 1972.
- Aydelotte, W. O. Quantification in History. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1971.
- _____, ed. The History of Parliamentary Behavior, Princeton, 1972.

- Anderson, Perry and Robin Blackburn, ed. Towards Socialism Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1966.
- Bagwell, Philip S. and G. E. Mingay. Britain and America, 1850-1939, A Study of Economic Change. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970.
- Bagehot, Walter, The English Constitution, Cornell University Press, 1963
- Barnett, Correlli. The Audit of War, The Illusion & Reality of Britain as a Great Nation. London, Macmillan, 1986.
- _____. The Collapse of British Power. London: Pan MacMillan, 1972, 1997, 2002.
- Bedarida, Francois. A Social History of England trans. A. S. Forster, New York: Routledge, 1991,
- Beales, Derek. From Castlereagh to Gladstone, 1815-1885. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1969.
- Broadberry, S. N. The Productivity Race: British Manufacturing in International Perspective, 1850-1990. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Checkland, S. G. The Rise of Industrial Society in England, 1815-1885. London: Longman, 1971.
- Clarke, Peter and Clive Trebilcock, eds. Understanding Decline: Perceptions and Reality of British Economic Performance. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988
- Collins, Bruce, and Keith Robbins, eds. British Culture and Economic Decline. New York: St. Martins Press, 1960.
- Conacher, J. B. The Aberdeen Coalition, 1852-1855. London: Cambridge University Press, 1968.
- _____. The Peelites and the Party System, 1846-1852. Hamden, Conn: David and Charles Archon Books, 1972.
- Cumberlege, George. The Economist, 1843-1943, A Centenary Volume. London: The Economist, 1943; reprint. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1953.
- Dintenfass, Michael. The Decline of Industrial Britain, 1870-1980. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Dormois, Jean-Pierre, and Michael Dintenfass. The British Industrial Decline. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Dugdale, Blanche E. C., Arthur James Balfour, First Earl of Balfour, K.G., O.M., F.R.S. Etc. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1937.

- Edwards, Ruth Dudley. The Pursuit of Reason, The Economist 1843-1993. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1993.
- Gash, Norman. Aristocracy and People: Britain, 1815-1865. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1979.
- Gat, Azar. A History of Military Thought: From the Enlightenment to the Cold War, Oxford UP, 2001.
- Goschen, George J. The Theory of the Foreign Exchanges, London: Effingham Wilson & Co., 1890
- Guttsman, W. G. The British Political Elite. New York: Basic Books, 1963.
- Harrison, J. F. C. The Early Victorians, 1832-1857. London: Weidenfield and Nicholson, 1971.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. The Age of Capital, 1848-1875. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1975.
- Jones, Wilbur Devereux and Arvel B. Erickson. The Peelites, 1846-1857. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1992.
- Joyce, Patrick Work, Society, and Politics, The culture of the factory in late Victorian England, Rutgers University Press, 1980.
- Kennedy, William P. Industrial Structure, Capital Markets, and the Origins of British Economic Decline. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Langford, Paul, and Christopher Harvie. The Eighteenth Century and the Age of Industry. Volume 4, the Oxford History of England, edited by Kenneth O. Morgan. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Lawson, Philip. The East India Company, A History. London: Longman, 1993.
- Lubenow, W. C. Parliamentary Politics and the Home Rule Crisis: The British House of Commons in 1886. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.
- LeMay, Godfrey H. L. The Victorian Constitution, Conventions, Usages, and Contingencies. London: Gerald Duckworth and Company, Ltd. 1979.
- Mathias, Peter. The First Industrial Nation. London: Methuen, 1969.
- Mayer, Arno J. The Persistence of the Old Regime, Europe to the Great War. New York: Pantheon Books, 1981.
- Moorman, John R. H. A History of the Church in England, Harrisburg, PA, 1994.
- Nairn, Tom. The Breakup of Britain. London: NLB, 1977.
- Neal, Larry. The Rise of Financial Capitalism: International Capital Markets in the Age of Reason. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

- Nockles, Peter B. The Oxford Movement in Context, Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760-1857, Cambridge: 1994.
- Owen, John. The Eighteenth Century, 1714-1815. New York: W. W. Norton, 1974.
- Offer, Avner. Property and Politics, 1870-1914: Landownership, Law, Ideology and Urban Development in England. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Perkin, Harold. The Origins of Modern English Society, 1780-1880. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969.
- Pope, Rex and Bernard Hoyle, eds. British Economic Performance, 1880-1980. London: Croom Helm, 1985.
- Read, Donald. Cobden and Bright, A Victorian Political Partnership. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1968.
- Robbins, Keith. John Bright. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979.
- Rubinstein, W. D. Capitalism, Culture, & Decline in Britain – 1750-1990. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Rosovsky, H., ed. Industrialization in Two Systems, New York: Wiley, 1966
- Sanderson, Michael. Education and Economic Decline in Britain, 1870 to the 1990s. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- _____, ed. The Universities in the Nineteenth Century. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975.
- Scott, John. The Upper Classes, Property and Privilege in Britain. London: MacMillan Press, Ltd. 1982.
- Searle G. R. Entrepreneurial Politics in Mid-Victorian Britain. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Stabile, Donald R. Economics, Competition and Academia: An Intellectual History of Sophism versus Virtue. Northampton, Ma. Edward Elgar, 2007.
- Steele, E. D. Palmerston and Liberalism, 1855-1865. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Turner, D. R. The Shadow Cabinet in British Politics. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.
- Whitson, Frank. The Economists in Parliament, 1780-1868. Durham: Duke University Press, 1980.
- Wiener, Martin J. English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit, 1850-1980. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Wolff, Janet and John Seed. The Culture of Capital: Art, Power, and the Nineteenth Century Middle Class. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988.

Articles

Aydelotte, W. O. 'The House of Commons in the 1840's' History 39, no. 107, October 1954: 249-262.

_____. 'A Statistical Analysis of the Parliament of 1841, Some Problems of Method.' Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research 27, no. 76 (November 1954): 141-155.

Knowlton, Steven R. 'The Voting Behavior of the Independent Irish Party, 1850-1859.' Eire-Ireland, (Spring 1991): 57-75.

Pumphrey, Ralph E. 'The Introduction of Industrialist into the British Peerage: A Study in Adaption of a Social Institution' American Historical Review 65, no. 1, (October 1959): 1-16.

Rubinstein, W. D. 'British Millionaires, 1809-1840.' Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research 47, no. 116, (November 1974): 202-223.

Wasson, Ellis A. 'House of Commons 1660-1945, Parliamentary Families and the Political Elite.' English Historical Review. (July 1991): 635-651.

Periodicals and Newspapers

"The Opening of the Great Exhibition. The Times 2 May 1851: 4.

Other

Wilde, Oscar. 'The Importance of Being Earnest', New York, Avon Books, 1965.

Unpublished Dissertations and Thesis

Hamilton, James Cook. 'Parties and Voting Patterns in the Parliament of 1874-1880.' Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Iowa, 1968.

Moncuse, James. 'James Wilson and the Economist, 1805-1860.' Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University, 1960.

Rosser, Alex S. 'Businessmen in the House of Commons, 1852-1857: Key Players or Mere Spectators?' Masters Thesis, University of Missouri – Kansas City, 1996.

Websites

London Gentlemen's Clubs

General Articles:

<<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gentlemen'sclub>>

"Gentlemen's Clubs." Mary Ann Sullivan, 2003.

<<http://www.bluffton.edu/~sullivanm/England/London/clubsintro/intro.html>>

For Alfred's Club:

The Victorian Dictionary. Ed. Lee Jackson. 2001.

<<http://www.victorianlondon.org/entertainment/alfredclub.htm>>

For the Army and Navy Club:

<<http://www.armynavyclub.co.uk/>>

For the Athenaeum Club:

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Athenaeum_Club>; <<http://www.athenaeumclub.co.uk>>

For Boodles Club:

<<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Boodles>>

For Brooks's Club:

<<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Brooks>>

For The Carlton Club:

<<http://www.carltonclub.co.uk/>>

For The Naval and Military Club:

<<http://www.navalandmilitaryclub.co.uk/>>

For The Oxford and Cambridge Club:

<<http://www.oxfordandcambridgeclub.co.uk>>

For The Reform Club:

<<http://www.reformclub.com/>>

For The Traveller's Club:

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Travelers_Club>; <<http://www.thetravellersclub.org.uk/>>

For White's club:

<<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/White's>>

Inns of Court

London:

Grays Inn:

<<http://www.graysinn.info/>>

Inner Temple:

<<http://innertemple.org.uk/>>

Lincolns Inn:

<<http://lincolnsinn.org.uk/>>

Middle Temple:

<<http://www.middletemple.org.uk/>>

Dublin:

Kings Inns:

<<http://www.kingsinns.ie/website/index.htm>>

Edinburgh:

Faculty of Advocates:

<<http://www.advocates.org.uk/>>

Businesses

For Allied Brewers and its predecessors:

<<http://www.midlandspubs.co.uk/worcestershire/oldbury.htm>>;
<<http://www.madeinbirmingham.org/ansells.htm>>;
<<http://www.breweryhistory.com/journal/archive/112/bh-112049.html>>
<<http://www.histman.co.uk/brewers/pages/L&Rbrewing.html>>

For Armstrongs:

<<http://www.archiveshub.ac.uk/news/02102501.html>> and
<<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vickers-Armstrongs>> and
<<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vickers>>

For Barclays Bank:

<<http://www.aboutbarclays.com/content/detail.asp?NewsAreaID=138>>.

I have an older printout of a previous Barclays website listing all of the constituent banks, which, unfortunately, seems to be unavailable today.

For Bass Brewery and predecessors:

<<http://www.breweryhistory.com/Defunct/LondonNorth.htm>>

For Cable and Wireless:

<http://www.experiencefestival.com/a/Cable_amp_Wireless_-_History/id/621518>

For the Clan Line:

<<http://www.oceanlinermuseum.co.uk/Clan%20Line%20History.html>>

For Commercial Union Assurance:

<<http://www.fundinguniverse.com/company-histories/COMMERCIAL-UNION-PLC-Company-History.html>>

For Courtauld's mergers:

<<http://www.knittingtogether.org.uk/doc.asp?doc=7380&cat=744>>

For The Ellerman Foundation:

<<http://www.ellerman.org.uk/>>

For Fine Spinners:

<<http://www.nationmaster.com/encyclopedia/Fine-Spinners-and-Doublers>>

For Fisons:

<<http://www.fundinguniverse.com/company-histories/Fisons-plc-Company-History.html>>

For Gibbs:

<http://www.insurancebrokers.hsbc.com/public/hibl/pdfs/hibl/en/broking_matters_issue30.pdf>

For GKN:

<<http://www.gkn.co.uk/Groupoverview/History.asp>>

For Head, Wrightson and Company:

<http://rememberwhen.gazettelive.co.uk/2008/04/head_wrightson.html>

For Jameson Distillery:

<<http://www.irishdistillers.com/about/historyofIrishDistillers.shtml> >

For John Brown:

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Brown_&_Company>

For John Foster's Black Dyke Mills:

<<http://www.johnfosterdirect.com/john-foster/>>

For Kenricks:

<<http://www.kenricks.co.uk/>>

For Kitson:

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kitson_&_Co.>

For Mappin and Webb:

<<http://www.mappin-and-webb.co.uk/history1.html>>

For Midland Bank:

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Midland_Bank> by redirection from Midland Bank.

For National Telephone:

<<http://web.ukonline.co.uk/freshwater/histuk.htm>>

For Nicholson and Sons:

<<http://www.fundinguniverse.com/company-histories/Scottish-amp;-Newcastle-plc-Company-History.html>>

For Pearsons:

<<http://www.pearson.com/index.cfm?pageid=14>>

For Pilkingtons:

<<http://www.pilkington.com/pilkington-information/about+pilkington/education/sir+alastair+pilkington.htm>>

<<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pilkington>>

For Rothschild:

<<http://www.rothschildarchive.org/ib/?doc=/ib/articles/BW4aTimeline>>

For Scottish and Newcastle and predecessors:

<<http://www.scottish-newcastle.com/othersnukbrands.aspx>>

For Seager Evans Distillery and successors:

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Seager_Evans_and_Co.>;

<http://www.glenugie.nl/pageID_6240395.html>

For Taylor, sons & Dawson, brewers:

<<http://www.suffolkcamra.co.uk/pubs/brewery/141> >

For Thomas Turton:

<<http://www.infomine.com/suppliers/contactstandard.asp?id=13105>>

For T. Richardson and sons, Ltd:

<<http://portcities.hartlepool.gov.uk/server.php?show=ConNarrative.52>>

For Vaux Brewery and predecessors:

<<http://stonch.blogspot.com/2007/10/vaux-of-sunderland.html>>;

<http://www.breweryarts.co.uk/about_us/>;

<<http://www.ukbusinesspark.co.uk/man66748.htm>>

For Watney, Combe, and Reid:

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Watney_Combe_&_Reid and <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=22279>>

For Westminster Bank:

<<http://www.fundinguniverse.com/company-histories/NATIONAL-WESTMINSTER-BANK-PLC-Company-History.html>>; <<http://www.coutts.com/history/index.asp>>

For William Arrol :

<<http://dalmarnock.eveningtimes.co.uk/area/sir-william-arrol.html>>;
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sir_William_Arrol_%26_Co.>;
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Clarke_Chapman>;
<http://www.langleys.com/site/2/Home.asp?nav_id=245>

For Whittle Brown and Predecessors:

<<http://www.boydharris.co.uk/wlw017.htm>>;
<http://www.mmc.gov.uk/rep_pub/reports/1985/fulltext/193c04.pdf>

For Young King and Company Distilleries:

Their records are located with those of the mile-end distillery and can be found:
http://historyofalcoholanddrugs.typepad.com/alcohol_and_drugs_history/2008/05/allied-brewery.html

Other

For Sir Henry Havelock-Allan, Bt.:

<<http://www.victoriacross.org.uk/bbhallan.htm>>;
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sir_Henry_Havelock-Allan,_1st_Baronet>

For honors:

<<http://www.honours.gov.uk>>

For Maynooth:

<<http://www.nuim.ie/about/history.shtm>>;
<http://www.victorianweb.org/religion/maynooth_Grant.html>

For Merchandise Marks Treaties:

<www.wipo.int/treaties/en/ip/paris/>;
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paris_Convention_for_the_Protection_of_Industrial_Property>