

- 21 Gladstone to Sir John Gladstone, 30 June 1849 (GGP, MS 229, f. 134).
- 22 Gladstone to F. R. Bonham, 2 Feb. 1847 (GP, Add. MS 44110, f. 214).
- 23 Gladstone to Sir John Gladstone, 15 Feb. 1847, 27 Feb. 1847 (GGP, MS 228, ff. 28, 37–38).
- 24 *3 Hansard*, cii. 630 (12 Feb. 1849).
- 25 'Public Humiliation', 14 Mar. 1847 (GP, Add. MS 44780, f. 180).
- 26 *The Times*, 15 Oct. 1864.
- 27 *3 Hansard*, xcvi. 130 (10 Apr. 1848).
- 28 Gladstone to Catherine Gladstone, 22 July 1848 (GGP, MS 771, ff. 78, 80).
- 29 *3 Hansard*, cii. 369, 556 (6 Feb. 1849, 9 Feb. 1849).
- 30 Clive J. Dewey, 'The Rehabilitation of the Peasant Proprietor in Nineteenth-Century Economic Thought', *History of Political Economy*, vi, no. 1 (1974), pp. 40–41.
- 31 Gray, *Famine*, pp. 151–52, 171–77.
- 32 *3 Hansard*, xcvi. 865, 1342–43 (22 Mar. 1848, 5 Apr. 1848).
- 33 Gray, *Famine*, pp. 56–57, 69–71.
- 34 Dewey, 'Peasant Proprietor', pp. 30, 32, 34–35.
- 35 *D*, iii, pp. 618, 671, iv, pp. 13, 16, 27, 32–34 (diary entries of 8 May 1847, 26 Nov. 1847, 25 Feb. 1848, 8 Mar. 1848, 14 Apr. 1848, 28 Apr. 1848, 29 Apr. 1848, 1 May 1848, 2 May 1848, 3 May 1848, 8 May 1848, 9 May 1848).
- 36 *Report from the Select Committee on the Farmers' Estate Society (Ireland) Bill*, PP, 1847–48 (535), xvii. 364.
- 37 *Ibid.*, p. 361.
- 38 *3 Hansard*, c. 978 (28 July 1848).
- 39 *Ibid.*, ci. 258 (18 Aug. 1848).
- 40 Gladstone to John Bright, 22 May 1869 (British Library, Bright Papers, Add. MS 43385, f. 31).
- 41 H. C. G. Matthew, *Gladstone, 1809–1898* (Oxford University Press, 1997), pp. 496–500; Allen Warren, 'Gladstone, Land and Social Reconstruction in Ireland, 1881–1887', *Parliamentary History*, ii (1983), pp. 155–57.
- 42 E. D. Steele, *Irish Land and British Politics: Tenant-Right and Nationality, 1865–1870* (Cambridge University Press, 1974), p. 312; K. Theodore Hoppen, 'Gladstone, Salisbury and the End of Irish Assimilation', in Mary E. Daly and K. Theodore Hoppen (eds.), *Gladstone: Ireland and Beyond* (Four Courts Press, 2011), p. 53.

maybe Mr Goodlad was behaving professionally rather than whimsically.

Michael Steed

Jo Grimond

I very much enjoyed reading the various articles about Jo Grimond in the Autumn 2013 edition (*Journal of Liberal History* 80). I twice chaired meetings with audiences of over a hundred in North East Fife in support of Menzies Campbell when Jo was guest speaker. One of my best memories was at a packed meeting in the Corn Exchange in Cupar, when Jo talked at length and in detail for over 45 minutes. He had one scrap of paper with his notes containing three words: 'farming, fishing, forestry'.

Your readers may be interested to know that, in addition to David Steel's Grimond memorial lecture, a second such lecture has been held in Jo's birthplace, St Andrews in North East Fife, organised by Lord Steel's brother, Professor Michael Steel. Jo wrote a short, attractive book about his birthplace: *The St Andrews of Jo Grimond*.

The well-attended lecture, on 15 November 2013, was jointly hosted by the University of St Andrews and North East and Central Fife Liberal Democrats, with financial support from the Joseph Rowntree Reform Trust, of which Jo was a director for many years. The lecture was delivered by Dr Ian Bradley, the Principal of St Mary's College, the Divinity College, in St Andrews University, and chaired by the Chancellor of the University, local MP Sir Menzies Campbell (see photo, right). Six members of the Grimond family were present as invited guests.

Dr Bradley knew Jo well, particularly in the period before he changed careers from journalism to the academic life. Dr Bradley wrote the entry about Jo Grimond in the *Dictionary of National Biography* and also the obituary which appeared in *The Times*, along with many articles about Jo and interviews with him..

Dr Bradley was attracted to the Liberal Party, like so many of my generation, by Jo and indeed was himself a Liberal candidate in the two general elections of 1974. He is currently an active supporter of the 'Better Together' campaign seeking a 'No' vote in the September 2014 referendum on Scottish Independence.

Derek Barrie

Jesse Collings (1)

With reference to David Boyle's interesting article on Jesse Collings (*Journal of Liberal History* 80), may I add some other facts about Collings' political career and its more general impact?

As an associate of Joseph Chamberlain, having been Mayor of Birmingham in 1878–79, he was originally elected as a Liberal in the two-member constituency of Ipswich in 1880. He did indeed move the successful amendment (carried by 331 votes to 252) to the Conservatives' Address in Reply to the Queen's Speech on 25 January 1886 which resulted in the resignation of the minority Conservative government on 29 January and the formation of Gladstone's third Liberal administration.

However, although Collings' amendment was of an agrarian nature, the division on 25 January was in reality a precursor of the Liberal split on Irish Home Rule a few months later. Seventeen Liberals and one Independent Liberal, including two former Liberal Cabinet Ministers (George Goschen and the Marquis of Hartington) and Sir Henry James (a former Liberal Attorney-General) voted with the Conservatives. Some seventy other Liberal MPs, including two other former Liberal Cabinet Ministers (John Bright and C.P. Villiers), were absent or abstained.

Although Collings accepted office in the new Liberal administration as Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board, he resigned when Joseph Chamberlain and George Otto Trevelyan left the Cabinet in opposition to Irish Home Rule. However,

LETTERS

Party agents

David Steel's story (in *Journal of Liberal History* 80, autumn 2013) about Jo Grimond asking a Lerwick solicitor, Mr Goodlad, to be his agent in 1945 and receiving his assent before he asked of Jo's party, no doubt raised a chuckle. But was it more normal than we might suppose?

I raise the question because my solicitor grandfather, F. A. Cloke, was in the 1920s variously clerk to the Eastry District Council and to its Poor Law Union, plus secretary of the East Kent Joint Town Planning Committee – as well as

agent for the Conservative MP for Dover.

He was, I believe, a Conservative in his politics – though his oldest daughter, a flapper voter in 1929, stuck up a Liberal poster in her bedroom window facing a main street in Sandwich. But I have understood that, as a solicitor, he performed an essentially legal and clerical role for the MP rather than a political one, and so could combine it with his non-political roles in local government.

Does any reader know whether this is correct? If so,



Grimond lecture, St Andrews, 15 November 2013 – Professor Louise Richardson (Principal and Vice-Chancellor of the University of St Andrews), Dr Ian Bradley and Sir Menzies Campbell

along with the other Liberal MP for Ipswich re-elected at the 1885 general election, he was then unseated on petition. At the resulting by-election on 14 April two Conservatives were elected. Thus Collings did indeed follow Chamberlain into Liberal Unionism, and was elected as a Liberal Unionist at the July 1886 general election, for Birmingham Bordesley, which he continued to represent until 1918. He supported Chamberlain's tariff reform/protectionist initiative from 1903 onwards.

Although out of Parliament during the debates on the Government of Ireland Bill, Collings may have indeed been 'outraged that so much urgent radical legislation was being postponed' for the Irish Bill during Gladstone's tenure as Prime Minister from February 1886 until the defeat of the Second Reading of the Bill on 8 June. However, before Trevelyan's resignation as Secretary for Scotland, he had moved the Second Reading of the Crofters' Holdings (Scotland) Bill in the Commons on 25 February. The Bill was then re-introduced in the Lords by his successor as Secretary for Scotland, the 13th (Scottish) Earl of Dalhousie, with the Second Reading therein on 20 May. The Bill was soon enacted with the new Crofting Commissioners being

sworn in at the Court of Session in Edinburgh on 20 July.

The 1886 Act gave crofters the right to a fair rent, the right not to be evicted if they paid their rent and, on giving up their tenure, the right to compensation for any improvements they had made. Such backing for the crofting community was thereafter of much significance for Liberal support in the Highlands and Islands. Given Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's commitment to land reform as from his 1868 election campaigns in Stirling Burghs, similar Bills followed from 1906 for the Scottish Lowlands, culminating in the passage of the Small Landholders (Scotland) Act in 1911.

Dr Sandy S. Waugh

Jesse Collings (2)

It's interesting that the article in September's journal on Jesse Collings (*Journal of Liberal History* 80) coincided with the opening of the fourth manifestation of Birmingham's Central Library. Many readers will be familiar with the demolition of the second, and the architectural controversy of the third, but the first building was actually destroyed in a fire.

Jesse Collings, who was Lord Mayor at the time, personally saved part of the valuable and valued Shakespeare

collection, apparently at some risk to himself. This risk may have been increased by his enormous side whiskers!

Roger Jenking

James Bryce and secondary education

The fine tribute to James Bryce (*Journal of Liberal History* 80) omitted reference to his important contribution to discussions of education policy when he was Chairman of the Liberal Government's Commission on Secondary Education, 1894–95.

The Bryce report made timely proposals. Unfortunately for the UK, they were largely ignored during the ten years of Conservative rule which followed in 1895–1905 – in particular by the 1902 Conservative Education Act and 1904 Regulations. It was the latter legislation which effectively created an inflexible basis for British secondary education for much of the twentieth century, thus impairing the development needed to make maximum use of native talents in combating growing international competition.

The Bryce report had argued that the previous classifications of schools in terms of leaving age and gradations of society were no longer appropriate in a rapidly developing society. At a time when most children were

leaving school at 12 to 14 years of age or earlier, it proposed that all children should remain at school until at least 15 or 16 years of age, with many continuing to 17 or 18 years.

The Bryce report argued that this dramatic leaving age extension was essential in order to achieve a significant improvement of the curriculum, particularly to cover technical and scientific subjects. It was felt that the country's progress would be severely restricted if the nineteenth-century growth of special and technical studies in schools did not continue. How right they proved to be!

Equally significant was the Bryce commission's prescience in its conclusions for a working definition of general education. The report argued that a redefinition had become urgent although difficult. It noted that many witnesses had testified to the growing danger of too early specialisation in education, a tendency which had been intensified by the use of scholarships, i.e. selection by examination.

Bryce did not have all the answers, but some of us might argue that after more than a century, Britain still suffers from being too slow to understand or accept key recommendations of his 1895 report.

Brian Cane