

ORATOR HUNT, M.P. FOR PRESTON,  
1830-32

BY WINIFRED PROCTOR, B.A.

Read before Preston Historical Society 4 March 1963

I THE COALITION

THE demagogue orator Hunt came to Preston as a parliamentary candidate in 1830 and, amid universal surprise, succeeded in unseating no less a person than the Hon. E. G. Stanley, later to be three times prime minister of England. After this somewhat spectacular rise to fame, Hunt fell swiftly into obscurity. That, in brief, is the story we have to relate, but in order to understand what happened, one must first hark back to the Preston election of 1768 (see TRANSACTIONS, Vol. CXI), and then take a passing glimpse at the social and political changes which had taken place in the town during the first thirty years of the nineteenth century.

In 1768 the whig Derby family had broken the power of the tory corporation, and, taking advantage of an ambiguously-worded resolution framed by parliament in 1661, had won for Preston the privilege of manhood suffrage. The Stanleys remained in unrivalled control of the electorate until 1796, when there was a sudden threat to one of their two seats. Great mills, the visible signs of the industrial revolution, now dominated the town, and with them had arisen a new social class, the great industrialists, later to vie in wealth and power with the landed gentry themselves. These men wanted representation at Westminster so as to further their own interests; and in 1796, John Horrocks, cotton master, contested one of the Preston seats and he received the support of the tory corporation. In the ensuing election he was defeated by a mere handful of votes.

The Derby family saw the writing on the wall. Here was a challenge, for every adult male in Preston possessed the franchise; therefore, as the number of operatives who worked in the mills went on increasing,<sup>(1)</sup> so the number of voters

<sup>(1)</sup> According to the census, the population of Preston was 24,627 in 1821, and had risen to 33,112 in 1831.

outside the sphere of the Stanley influence increased also, and against the workman who refused to vote as his employer wished, the cotton master could, and furthermore did, employ that very potent weapon the "sack", since voting was not secret. It was clear that the Stanleys could not hope to retain both seats, and so, in 1802, they entered into a coalition with their old opponents, the tory corporation, in the hope of barring the way to any one of the growing number of candidates with liberal views who might aspire to find a seat in Preston. The corporation agreed to set aside the "ancient grudge" born of their political struggle with the Derby family in 1768, and in 1802 Lord Stanley, the whig, and John Horrocks, the tory, were returned as members of parliament without a contest.

This coalition remained firmly entrenched for twenty-four years. Naturally, it met with considerable opposition from the inhabitants of Preston, who found themselves virtually disfranchised thereby. Consequently, some attempt was made at every election after 1804 to destroy the coalition. Meanwhile, in Britain as a whole the movement for parliamentary reform, which had been driven underground at the time of the French revolution, gradually gained strength. In Preston the situation was unique. The toiling male cotton operatives and weavers of Preston, often under-employed and ill-housed, had the right to vote, and little by little they began to realise that the vote, if wisely used, might bring them concrete advantages in the shape of bread and meat; so they were ready to extend open arms to any candidate who might break the power of the whig and tory coalition. In consequence, between 1807 and 1820, the so-called independents, and the radicals represented by Henry Hunt, sought to gain a footing in Preston with its huge working-class<sup>(2)</sup> electorate. Both groups were unsuccessful. The coalition remained supreme till it died a natural death in 1826, after the corporation had decided to play no further part in the political life of the town. At this time radicalism, which had collapsed after the Peterloo affair in 1819 and the repressive governmental measures which followed it, dared once more to raise its battered head, and at the election of 1826 William Cobbett was to be seen on the hustings in the gallery of the Preston Corn Exchange accompanied by three other candidates, one of whom was the Hon. E. G. Stanley, appearing on this occasion for the first time to solicit the votes of his father's former constituents. Cobbett suffered a heavy defeat. Four years later, in July 1830,

<sup>(2)</sup> According to Asa Briggs, the term "working class" cannot be used in speaking of this period with any degree of precision. It included not only skilled workers and self-educated artisans, but also rough casual labourers and illiterates.

the "matchless" Orator Hunt, clad in his blue frock coat and wearing his famous white hat, came over Walton bridge by coach to chance his luck once more at the Preston hustings.

## II THE ELECTION OF AUGUST 1830

Both the Preston election of August 1830, and the by-election which followed in December 1830, have a manifold interest. They not only give us a vivid picture of a political duel fought between the Hon. E. G. Stanley and the ultra-radical Henry Hunt, but they also depict one of the stages in the gradual development of the representative system of this country. In addition, in common with other elections which were taking place elsewhere, they foreshadow the formation of a new kind of state in Britain—a state in which an increasing amount of control was to come from the centre. Hitherto the day-to-day administration of affairs had been mainly in the hands of corporations and magistrates, who conducted parliamentary elections, for example, very much as they wished, with little or no interference from outside. However, as the nineteenth century advanced and life became more and more complex, the central government found itself forced almost willy-nilly to interfere in local administration. In particular, it decided, in 1827, to reform the conduct of elections. Over the years, the cost of parliamentary contests<sup>(3)</sup> had grown so heavy that, generally speaking, only a candidate with the strongest financial backing could reach Westminster; on this account many Englishmen who could have given useful service to their country were precluded from sitting in parliament. Accordingly, a select committee was appointed to inquire into the manner of taking the poll at elections, and Nicholas Grimshaw, ex-mayor of Preston, was asked to give evidence. Some of the suggestions made by the committee were incorporated in the act of 1828 whose primary object was to reduce the length of time devoted to elections, and therefore the expense involved. This act was in force during the Preston election of August 1830, with memorable consequences for both E. G. Stanley and Orator Hunt.

As the constitution demanded, parliament was dissolved on the death of George IV in 1830, and writs for a general election to be held in the following August were immediately issued. Three candidates presented themselves. E. G. Stanley, whig; John Wood, "liberal"; and the radical Henry Hunt who had

<sup>(3)</sup> The election expenses of the Preston coalition candidates in 1820 amounted to £11,559 12s. 8d. Of this sum £1,047 was spent on ribbons, £8, 203 in public houses, and one halfpenny on bread.

been defeated in the Preston election of 1820. Whigs and radicals detested each other and, with two seats to be filled, it was obvious that Wood's position was practically secure, as he was bound to be the second choice of every elector who did not choose to plump. The main struggle, therefore, was due to take place between Stanley and Hunt. E. G. Stanley and John Wood were already sitting candidates.

John Wood was a barrister-at-law, and the eldest son of a Liverpool merchant. He was afterwards chairman successively of the Board of Stamps and Taxes and of the Board of Excise.

Henry Hunt was born in 1773, in Wiltshire, and was of middle-class origin. He came of farming stock and continued to farm even after entering political life. Subsequently he became a manufacturer of blacking. On a visit to London he was introduced to the radical leaders, and began to take an interest in the movement for parliamentary reform, later becoming acquainted with several of the Lancashire reformers. He contested Bristol in 1812, Westminster in 1818, Preston in 1820, and Somerset in 1826, but was unsuccessful in every case. After the meeting at St. Peter's Fields in Manchester, of which he was chairman, he was arrested on a charge of treason, and sentenced in 1820 to two years imprisonment in Ilchester Gaol, Somerset, and required to give as security on release the sum of £1,000 and also two sureties of £500 each.

In the sphere of politics he was an extreme radical, demanding annual parliaments, manhood suffrage, vote by ballot and the repeal of the corn laws. The sufferings of the poor who lived in the district in which he was born excited his sympathy, and throughout his political career he claimed to be the champion of the over-worked and ill-paid working man. He was the idol of the crowds, and his sonorous voice never failed to attract large audiences. Between himself and his supporters he established a feeling of "togetherness", his election speeches being delivered in a tone of kindly bonhomie which won his hearer's hearts. Always he spoke to the working-class crowds in language they could understand. He was witty, humorous, and a past-master in the use of the apt and homely phrase, though it must be admitted that his English was not always beyond reproach. When abroad in the town, he affected the greatest simplicity, even to the point of carrying his dinner, a quarter of lamb, on his shoulder through the streets. Last, but not least, he knew that even the workman does not live by bread alone, but also needs circuses and merriment. At his command his followers cheered heartily for their friends, groaned with the greatest of gusto for their enemies, burned effigies of E. G. Stanley and



*Reproduced by kind permission of the Lancashire Record Office*

Plate 12. HENRY HUNT

Painted in Ilchester Gaol, September 1822



*Reproduced by kind permission of the National Portrait Gallery*

Plate 13. THE FOURTEENTH EARL OF DERBY  
Formerly the Hon. E. G. Stanley

other unpopular figures in the open streets, and paraded the town at night with flaming tar barrels, gay banners and musical bands.

Unfortunately, his personal character was marred by certain ugly traits: he was quarrelsome, truculent, domineering and jealous of the popularity even of his own colleagues. When roused to indignation, he launched volley after volley of abuse at the objects of his wrath; in fact, Huish, his biographer, speaking of Hunt's quarrel with William Cobbett, remarks, "A tirade of abuse and vilification was carried on by both parties to an extent at once disgraceful to themselves and injurious to the cause they meant to serve". In the opinion of his contemporaries, Hunt's greatest failing was his inordinate vanity, so that, in the end, what he really sought was popularity and fame, and not social justice for the down-trodden. Here is a pen-picture of the "matchless orator" as he appeared to an observer when Hunt made his entrance for the first time into the House of Commons in 1831:

"I take it that the personal appearance of Mr. Hunt is too well known to require description. He is, take him altogether, perhaps the finest-looking man in the house of commons; tall, muscular, with a healthful, sun-tinged complexion, and a manly Hawthorne deportment—half yeoman, half gentleman sportsman. To a close observer of the human face divine, however, his features are wanting in energy of will and fixedness of purpose, and the mouth is usually garnished with a cold simper, not very compatible with that heart-born enthusiasm which precludes all doubt of truth and sincerity. . . . a restless thirst of excitement, great personal vanity, and the accident of circumstances exclusively local and personal and not depth of conviction have won for him his 'radical' notoriety. As it is, however, he will be a useful member, were it only as an echo of the prejudices of the people."<sup>(4)</sup>

The Hon. Edward George Geoffrey Smith Stanley was born on 29 March 1799 and succeeded to the title as fourteenth Earl of Derby in June 1851. He first entered the House of Commons as M.P. for Stockbridge, and in 1826 he succeeded his father in one of the Preston seats. He was under-secretary for the colonies in 1827, chief secretary for Ireland in 1830, and was three times prime minister of England, in 1852, 1858, and 1866, when, "taking a leap in the dark", as he said, he fought for the passage of the 1867 reform bill. In the early days of his career he considered himself to be a whig-liberal, yet his zeal for reform, as W. D. Jones points out in his book *Lord Derby and Victorian Conservatism*, was probably less ardent than that of a Russell or a Grey. He was a staunch supporter of the British constitution, and while always anxious to eliminate what he called its "abuses", he shrank from taking any action

<sup>(4)</sup> *New Monthly Magazine*, March 1831.

that might violate it. Consequently, on the matter of parliamentary reform he was cautious and resolutely opposed to sweeping change. Yet he admitted that in the face of "unjust" demands made by the radical reformers, the making of "reasonable concessions" was the only policy to be adopted. He regarded the vote not as a right but as a privilege to be enjoyed only by men of property and intelligence. Hence, in his view the lower classes were but weaker brethren incapable of exercising the franchise wisely without the guidance of their social superiors. Further, he was of the opinion that to demand voting by ballot was to trample on the just rights of the nobility, and he declared that "the influence of rank and property was an influence recognised by the English constitution and interwoven with its representative system". In fact, Stanley's utter disregard for the feelings of men who were of the "lower class" or who were of little ability, goes far to explain why he was so unpopular<sup>(5)</sup> with the radicals of Preston at this period. In December 1830 he declared that certain radicals who had distributed a printed address in the town were nothing more than "contemptible rubbish". E. G. Stanley was an aristocrat in deportment, dress, speech and political ideals, and the sight of the young lord (called by Bulwer Lytton "the Rupert of Debate"), haughty, contemptuous and ironic, fighting a duel of words with the ebullient Hunt must have provided the Prestonians with much entertainment.

The election opened in an atmosphere of social unrest and economic upheaval, and the main question of the day in August 1830 was how to bring relief to the suffering poor. Various remedies were suggested; for example, the abolition of the monopoly of the East India Company and the repeal of the corn laws, which would respectively cheapen tea and bread; retrenchment in every sphere of the administration; and last, but not least, the reform of parliamentary representation. This last measure was demanded especially by the middle and lower classes, who saw in it a remedy for all their ills, but Stanley, while deploring the abject misery of the artisan class, declared

<sup>(5)</sup> A. Hewitson in his *History of Preston* (1883) describes an attack made on Stanley in the streets of Preston as reported by an eye-witness. "While the polling was going on, the hon. E. G. Stanley spoke out of one of the windows of the Bull in Church Street, and he displeased the populace by saying that he was not going to be returned by the lower classes or by those wearing fustian. They hissed him and the lower classes turned against him. Afterwards, while going down Lune Street, he was set upon by the mob back and front; and at the corner of Fleet Street he was thrown down, and spat upon and shamefully abused. I was in my shop, saw him on the ground and dragged him out of the gutter. They threatened to murder me. I got him into my shop, bolted the door, and then along with my wife took him upstairs and hid him in a closet."

that political interference would not improve their lot. Nevertheless, it was evident that Englishmen were witnessing the dawn of a new era. The Test and Corporation Acts had been repealed in 1828, the Catholic Emancipation Act had been passed in 1829, the whigs were gathering strength under the leadership of Althorp and Grey, while the outcome of the July revolution in France was destined to quicken the movement for parliamentary reform.

Dusty with travel after his long journey from London, Hunt made his entry on to the hustings on the very eve of polling day, having been nominated in his absence by his supporters. As always, he was greeted with full-throated applause from his fellow radicals, much to the annoyance of Stanley, who, immaculately dressed, was already making a speech. There is no doubt that Hunt enjoyed the situation to the full. His somewhat theatrical arrival on the scene of battle was not, however, the result of planned stage-management. It was probably due to the fact that when first invited to sit as a parliamentary candidate for Preston, Hunt, as a business man, had shrewdly decided that it was unwise to do so because, faced with such a formidable opponent as E. G. Stanley, he was not absolutely certain of success, and also because, under the provisions of the act of 1828, he would be forced to pay his own election expenses. Fortunately for him, help came, apparently from an unexpected quarter. The great majority of the Preston tories, angered by the way in which the last election in 1826 had been conducted, had finally decided to remain aloof and to take no part in the election, but a militant few, including the editor of the tory newspaper *Preston Pilot*, evidently thought it wiser to gamble a little on the radical leader's chances of success. They therefore offered to pay Hunt's election expenses if he would come to Preston and try to oust Stanley from his seat. Hunt agreed, and set out post-haste for Preston.

The election was held in the Corn Exchange. This was a new building, which had been opened in 1824. It consisted of a large open area surrounded by a gallery on three sides. The polling booths were erected in the area, the hustings in the gallery above. Following the pattern adopted at the period, the proceedings opened with nomination day. The mayor, together with his two bailiffs, and Richard Palmer, the town clerk, presided over the court. Nominations were made and seconded. Then came the customary futile show of hands, futile because the assembled crowd included many strangers who had come into the town to enjoy the fun. These visitors not only booed, and hissed and jeered and cheered with the Prestonians them-

selves, but also took part in the show of hands. Besides, any one who dared to raise a hand in favour of a candidate not acceptable to those immediately surrounding him in the crowd, might find himself the victim of what was euphemistically called "a constitutional squeeze". The candidates who were rejected at the show of hands then demanded a poll, which demand was at once acceded to by the mayor, Mr. Mounsey.

On this occasion it was the duty of the mayor to administer the act of 1828. The act required that not more than 600 persons should be allowed to vote in any one booth, but gave no directions concerning the indications to be given to voters as to which booth to use. The mayor, therefore, as chief returning officer, apparently fearing confusion in the hall, decided to adopt the plan of voting by district, the system of voting by tallies, as at former elections, being abandoned. The overseers of the poor, who were responsible for the collection of the poor rate, had already, for their own convenience, divided the town into ten districts, and to each of these districts Mr. Mounsey allotted its own polling booth. The difficulty was, however, that most of the electors did not know the number of the district in which they lived, and it is more than probable that many of them, even if they were able to read, were quite unable to understand the posters which had appeared in the town setting forth the "new-fangled" arrangements for the conduct of the election. Someone therefore had to inform the would-be voter of the number of the booth at which he must present himself. Mr. Mounsey duly found a solution to his problem. The act of 1828 declared that, at the request of one of the candidates, every elector should be required to take the oaths of supremacy, abjuration and fidelity before casting his vote, and seemingly, in Hunt's absence, Stanley and Wood had consented to this arrangement being made.

Accordingly, at the opening of the poll, commissioners for oaths took up their quarters in the hall, and it was to these commissioners that the mayor entrusted the task of directing the voters to their booths. To each elector was to be given a certificate that he had taken the oaths, and this certificate was to bear the printed number of the booth at which he must vote. Mounsey's plan worked well, but the voter himself had yet another ordeal to face. There was, as yet, no register of electors; consequently, each elector was forced, if so required, to prove the validity of his vote. If this was in doubt, he was referred, as the act of 1828 decreed, to the court of the returning officer, which was held in a room apart (the cheese room), and

the main task of which was to decide the legality of disputed votes. In previous elections the examination of doubtful cases had been carried out in the booth itself, while long lines of would-be electors waited their turn to vote. The change introduced by the 1828 act had the effect of reducing this delay. Trivial though these minor details about the day-to-day conduct of the election may seem, they are nevertheless important, for in the tentative act of 1828 may be found the genesis of some of the clauses of the reform act of 1832.

Both the tory *Preston Pilot* and the liberal-independent *Preston Chronicle* report the election in full, but their accounts are in part confusing. The following facts can be gleaned however. Within the framework of the act of 1828, there could perhaps have been no fairer plan for the conduct of the election than that devised by the mayor, Mr. Mounsey. But, as was to be expected, the candidates sought to profit by the flaws in the act and in the scheme itself. Both Stanley and Hunt tried to delay the poll by "objecting" to one another's voters for more or less frivolous reasons, in the hope that the returning officers, whose task it was to decide disputed votes, might dally so long over the business that some of the electors would remain unpolled at the close of the contest.

It was obvious that the advantage lay with Stanley, if wealth and a host of influential friends could win the day. Hunt had neither, and was at the further disadvantage that both Stanley and the cotton masters profited by the absence of the ballot to influence their employees, their tenants and the shopkeepers who were dependent on their custom. Consequently, the radicals, in spite of the financial help given them by the tories, were obliged to depend largely on their wits. Hunt decided, therefore, that his best plan of campaign was to cause confusion in the hall, and he took advantage of what proved to be the chief drawback in Mounsey's plan. As long as the commissioners for oaths continued to direct the voters to their booths, there was no disorder. However, the time-worn ceremony of taking the oaths had, by 1830, become sheer mummery. Voters were sworn as many as twenty or thirty at a time, and some amused themselves by repeating the Lord's prayer, or the "belief", probably in garbled form, instead of the prescribed oaths. In consequence, when Hunt complained that the putting of the oaths tended to delay the poll and also that the fees of the legal gentlemen who administered them involved the candidates in extra expense, it was unanimously decided to dispense with both the commissioners and the oaths. The commissioners departed, therefore, and the irksome chore of directing the now

bewildered electors to their booths fell upon the candidates themselves.

Seemingly, Hunt congratulated himself on his sly manoeuvre, and left the hall to brag to his friends about his clever ruse. Possibly he thought that his own men would succeed in battling their way through to the booths before Stanley's voters had the chance of doing so. Unfortunately, during the "matchless orator's" absence, Stanley called up sixty lawyers, obviously hired beforehand in case of emergency, to pilot his own supporters through the crowd of spectators, and when Hunt returned to the Corn Exchange it was to find that the booths were filled to overflowing with Stanley's voters, while his own men were wandering about unshepherded. Later in the same day Hunt had further cause for complaint when he discovered that the Catholics, who at this election could use their votes for the first time without violating their consciences, were voting almost solidly for Stanley. On this occasion he repeated his first manoeuvre in reverse; that is to say, in an effort to delay the poll, he demanded that the oaths should be administered to every would-be elector.

On the morning of the second day, however, he changed his tactics once again. It was observed that, as the hour of eleven approached, he constantly consulted his watch with an air of eager expectancy. Then, suddenly, as if the time were ripe for action, he suggested that the oaths were no longer necessary. The other candidates willingly gave their assent, only to find a few moments later that they had been duped, for the tramp of feet in the distance announced the arrival of what was known as "the black fleet". This was a body of mechanics, three hundred strong. With the green flag of independence at their head, they marched in orderly fashion into the hall, to the music of an excellent band composed of some of their own members. Hunt gave a short address, and immediately afterwards, as the oaths were no longer required, the mechanics made a sudden rush into the booths, blocking the entrances to all Stanley's voters. In the ensuing chaos, the "black fleet" voted almost to a man for Hunt and Wood.

Yet even at this moment of apparent triumph Hunt knew that he was already beaten. In fact before the last mechanic left the polling booth Stanley had already reached the head of the poll. The latter, however, had little reason to be proud of the manner in which he had won his victory. At the end of the first day the polling figures ran thus: Wood, 595; Stanley, 509; Hunt, 371. Stanley, who fully expected to head the poll, was appalled. In despair, the whigs made a frantic appeal to the

tories, who, at last placated, promised their support to the Derby interest, and on the next day, a Sunday, to their shame, Stanley's friends opened the taps of the several public houses which the Derby family owned in the borough. What happened on Monday, the second day of the poll, is best told in the words of the *Preston Chronicle*:

"Although on Monday the streets did not present those scenes of beastly drunkenness which generally disgrace a contested election, nevertheless the labours of Sunday met their due reward, for on Sunday the taverns were at work throughout the day, and towards evening the public houses were crowded with 'unbought, unbiassed and uninfluenced' electors, duly instructed how, on the morrow, to exercise the noble privilege which the law had given to them. On Monday, the invited guests who had been so well treated the day before, mustered at the inns in their respective districts, where meat and drink were dispensed with liberal profusion and clothing was provided for those who lacked it. From these feasting places the parties flocked to the poll, and continued to plump for Stanley so fast that they soon overcame Wood's majority of Saturday and by 11 o'clock Mr. Stanley was at the head of the poll."

Hunt was beaten, and on the Tuesday he took his leave. The polling figures, declared on Wednesday, were as follows: Stanley, 2,996; Wood, 2,489; Hunt, 1,308. The length of time allowed for the taking of the poll by the act of 1828 was eight days, yet this election was completed in less than four. Furthermore, a greater number of votes was taken than at the previous contest in 1826, which had lasted as long as fifteen days.

In spite of his failure to win a seat, Hunt had nevertheless constituted a real menace to the whig cause. Though a minority of the tory party had supported him, the main body in the end tipped the scales against him, their hatred of the landed whigs and their proposed reform act having been finally overcome by fear of a possible revolution if the radicals should come to power. *The Preston Pilot* summed up the situation with the following pithy comment, "A whig member has been returned through tory influence in a radical community".

### III THE BY-ELECTION OF DECEMBER 1830

Between August and December of the same year the movement in favour of parliamentary reform gathered impetus. On 2 November the Duke of Wellington as prime minister made a declaration against any change whatsoever in the system of parliamentary representation. Henceforth doomed, he resigned office on 30 November, after a motion for an enquiry into the civil list had been carried against the government. Thereupon Grey accepted office with, says G. M. Trevelyan, "a cabinet, and thereby a new parliamentary party, sufficiently advanced in opinion to accept a sweeping reform bill, and yet sufficiently

broad-bottomed to muster the votes to carry it.”<sup>(6)</sup> Under this new administration E. G. Stanley was appointed chief secretary for Ireland and was therefore forced to seek re-election at Preston. John Wood, his colleague at the previous election, of course retained his seat and did not enter the lists. The Preston radicals, in search of an opponent for Stanley, wrote to Hunt, who was then in Bridgewater in Somerset, announcing their intention of putting him in nomination. Hunt replied that he had no hope of being returned, but if the electors placed him at the head of the poll on the first day, he would come as fast as horses could carry him.

The mayor and chief returning officer on this occasion was the tory Nicholas Grimshaw, who, at the time of the Preston contest of December 1830, was already seventy-two years old, and was known as “the grand old man of Preston”. A popular and able lawyer, he had been town clerk from 1793 to 1801, and mayor no fewer than seven times. It seems unlikely that a man who was held in such high esteem by his fellow townsmen would allow either private feeling or political conviction to interfere with what he considered to be his public duty. Yet, on his return to London after his defeat, Stanley, in conversation with Charles Greville, declared that he owed the loss of the Preston seat to the ill-will, or perhaps to the stupidity, of the mayor. Grimshaw’s own point of view is perfectly clear. He considered that the act of 1828 was badly framed. Nevertheless, it was his duty, as chief returning officer, to administer the act exactly as it was printed. The act gave no directions about indicating which booth the individual voter was to use, and therefore, as far as Grimshaw was concerned, the electors could cast their votes exactly where they pleased. Accordingly, he doggedly refused, in spite of urgent appeals from Stanley and his committee, to follow the example of Mr. Mounsey at the previous election, and adopt the system of “district voting”.

Unfortunately, the method of “indiscriminate voting” which was now adopted, threw the door wide open to fraud, and the electors of Preston certainly took advantage of the situation. No sooner had the gates of the Corn Exchange been thrown open on the morning of 8 December, than the Huntites arrived in hordes and appeared to be acting on a pre-concerted plan. A general free-for-all developed, and it was impossible to keep order, though no fewer than ten special constables were stationed in each of the ten booths. Throughout the contest Stanley never ceased to bombard the mayor with complaints.

<sup>(6)</sup> *Lord Grey of the Reform Bill* (1920), p. 245.

He asserted that Hunt's men were polling three or four times each and that if any objection was raised his agents were maltreated and turned out of the booths. The Huntites retaliated by declaring that Stanley's friends were raising frivolous objections against those who wished to vote radical. Stanley also complained about the lack of protection given to his voters, many of whom, he said, were too frightened to come to the poll. To this the mayor replied that he himself had gone down into the area on several occasions and that he generally found things "proceeding very orderly".

Hunt's men do not seem to have wasted much time in making complaints. They were men of action, and, as such, they settled all disputes there and then by strength of arm on the floor of the area, with the result that Stanley's agents had not the courage to challenge the validity of the votes which were tendered for Hunt. The mayor's court, whose duty it was, as at the last election, to examine dubious cases, therefore had no business, and after the first day of the contest the room assigned to it remained empty. The *Preston Pilot* gives a lively account of the misfortunes of those whom the radicals called "the 5/- men". It was reported that Stanley's voters were receiving tickets by which they were able to get "refreshment" to the amount of 5/-, and any man who was suspected of accepting this princely gift received "instant castigation" from Huntites.

"In one instant, several hundreds were upon him, the ejection from the booth and the area became the work of a moment, and in as short a space of time the fragments of his apparel were to be seen flying about in all directions amid the shouts and exultations of the delighted multitude. Another summary mode of treating obnoxious persons was to follow them by hundreds and kick and cuff them along the adjacent streets till they were lucky enough to find an asylum."

At the end of the first day, 8 December, the radicals found, to their delight, that they had scored 1,204 votes to Stanley's 791, and, "in a high state of exaltation", they paraded the streets in great numbers, with music, flambeaux, a lighted tar-barrel and three flags, one of them tri-coloured. For the next three days the radicals continued to head the poll with majorities of 413, 417, and 494. On the evening of Friday, 11 December, the *Chronicle* made the following doleful remark:

"There are now more votes taken by some hundreds, than were tendered at the last election, although it was considered at that time that not many more could be brought up. The results have astounded all descriptions of persons here."

During Sunday, both sides made great efforts to recruit supporters for their cause, and on Monday,

"Many more votes were given accordingly than it was supposed to be able to muster. The lame, the impotent, and the sick were collected from all quarters and brought in carriages to the polling booths. Several, not being able to leave the carriages in which they came, in order to go into the booths, were attended by the poll clerks at the carriage windows and there delivered their suffrages. There is now no chance of obtaining a majority for Mr. Stanley."

During the following three days till the end of the poll on Wednesday, 15 December, Stanley succeeded in gaining the majority of the votes cast, but when the poll books were finally closed and cast up, he was found to be the loser, as he had scored only 3,392 votes to Hunt's 3,730. Hunt was already in the town, having arrived as late as 11 p.m. on the Monday before.

In comparison with the election which had taken place in the town in 1826, this election was quiet. No one was seriously hurt, not a drop of liquor was distributed, and there were no scenes of drunkenness. The town clerk, Richard Palmer, speaking in 1832, declared that the Preston election of December 1830, had been "peaceable". The contest had lasted seven days.

Before leaving for London on the day after the poll ended, Stanley addressed to his former constituents a letter of farewell, which concluded with these words:

"Gentlemen,

A parliamentary connection has, for many years, subsisted between your borough and the family to which I belong, which I had hoped, had not been unproductive of advantage to the town of Preston. The rupture of that connection has been your act. I acquiesce in your decision, and shall make no attempt, in future, to renew it."

In a second communication to the electors Stanley announced his intention of demanding a scrutiny of the votes "taken on the other side", and asserted that Hunt had been "in a great degree indebted for his majority to an influx of strangers from all parts of the country". Meanwhile Hunt had asked that the scrutiny should be extended to cover all the voters who had been polled on *both* sides; the mayor, after acceding to his request, declared that he himself needed rest, and postponed the date of the enquiry till Monday, 20 December. Both candidates demanded copies of the poll books. This meant considerable delay, for the clerks engaged to do the work made so many errors that a whole night and a day were wasted in making the necessary corrections. At Hunt's desire, therefore, the enquiry was again postponed till the following Friday, 24 December. On that day, however, to the surprise of all, Stanley's committee suddenly announced that their chief had decided to abandon the scrutiny without further ado.

A letter to the people of Preston gave the reasons for this move, and set forth Stanley's grievances. To continue the contest, it was said, would have the probable effect of producing excitement and turbulence in the town, without a well-grounded hope of ultimate victory. The letter also asserted that the adjournment of the enquiry had reduced the number of days which could be given to the proceedings, and therefore Stanley's chances of success. In addition, the committee complained of the unwarrantable delay in furnishing candidates with copies of the poll books, and censured the mayor, Nicholas Grimshaw, for the manner in which he had conducted the election; the returning officer had failed to offer any protection to electors on their way to vote, and, furthermore, an extraordinary construction had been put upon the act of parliament regulating the mode of taking the poll, in direct opposition to that which had been adopted at the previous election. However, it is evident that Stanley's committee, for its part, had already completed its scrutiny of the election results, as the official poll book prints in italics the names of 1,245 of Hunt's adherents whose votes were considered to be fraudulent. It is, of course, possible that while probing the validity of the votes cast "by the other side" Stanley's supporters unearthed evidence which showed that their own party was not entirely without sin, and decided that it would be folly on their part to cast the first stone.

Writing about this election in 1868, William Dobson was probably right when he declared that it is impossible to say on which side the real majority lay. Perhaps the only comment that can be made on the outcome of this contest<sup>(7)</sup> is simply to place on record the fact that Hunt owed his victory to the idolatrous affection of his followers, who, in their frenzied enthusiasm, used every means in their power, however dubious, to carry their leader to the top of the poll.

Some five weeks later, Hunt took his seat in the House of Commons, and during the early days of his parliamentary career he seems to have made a fairly favourable impression on most observers. A writer in the *New Monthly Magazine* (March 1831) has left us an amusing description of Hunt's reception by the Speaker of the House:

<sup>(7)</sup> In order to commemorate his victory, Hunt had a number of silver medals struck. It was apparently his intention in the first instance to present one of these medals to each of his voters, but, as the election funds either ran short or were mishandled, he actually sold them to all who cared to buy for 2/6. apiece. Several of these medals are now preserved in the Harris Museum, Preston; some are of silver alloy.

"I was particularly curious to witness the début of the hon. member for Preston, in an assembly so little accustomed, as is that so long misnamed the house of commons, to such an out-and-outer of the Demos coming between the wind and their nobility—to see whether any *gaucherie* of manner would betray an uneasy consciousness of his not being quite at ease amongst those scions of aristocracy who occupy benches originally intended for the virtual representatives of the people. Mr. Hunt, on the whole, bore himself well. . . . But once, and that for a moment, did his self-possession seem to fail him while going through the ceremonies preceding a new member's taking his seat. After the member has signed his name, and taken the oaths, he is formally introduced by the clerk of the house to the speaker, who usually greets the new trespasser on his patience by a shake of the hand. This ceremony is generally performed by the present speaker with a gloved hand towards those not particularly distinguished by wealth or pedigree. When the new member for Preston was introduced to him, he was in the act of taking snuff with his glove off. Mr. Hunt made a bow, not remarkable for its graceful repose, at a distance—apprehensive, as it struck me, that the acknowledgment would be that of a *noli me tangere*, exclusive. He was agreeably disappointed; the speaker gave him his ungloved hand at once in a manner almost cordial; and Mr. Hunt took his seat, evidently pleased by the flattering courtesousness of his reception."

Charles Greville, too, writing in February 1831, found the new M.P. for Preston by no means unattractive:

"Hunt spoke for two hours last night, his manner and appearance very good, like a country gentleman of the old school, a sort of rural dignity about him, very civil and good-humoured."

As we shall see, however, later comments on Hunt's behaviour and performance as a speaker were not always so favourable.

Hunt entered parliament when the great reform bill was on the stocks. He was present when it was launched by Russell in March 1831, and took an active part in the debates which followed. The battle at Westminster was being fought out between the tories who were in the main satisfied with the representative system as it stood, and the whigs who wanted only a moderate measure of reform. Hunt stood apart, and, as the champion of the deprived and the depressed, played a lone hand. To him the struggle for reform resolved itself simply into a fight to the death between two great political factions. Whatever the outcome, the working man would, in the end, find himself duped, for neither whig nor tory had the slightest intention of giving the artisan the tiniest portion of his political rights. "The people, the rights of the people," wrote Hunt in his *Addresses to the Reformers*, "have no more to do with the question than the Emperor of Morocco."

Consequently, having with much misgiving voted for what he called this "humbug of a reform bill", because, as he said, it would at least make "one great inroad into that accursed system which had brought the house into contempt with every man of common sense and with the whole world", Hunt immediately set to work to criticise the bill from the point of view of the

working man. Indeed, in his speeches both inside and outside the house the "Preston Cock" never wearied in his attempts to induce his colleagues in the house to give a more democratic complexion to Lord John Russell's bill. He complained that the whig ministers had lacked a guiding principle when they framed the clauses of the measure, which, in consequence, could only be termed a "mixty-maxy hodge-podge". Was it people or property which should be the subject of representation, for example? The underpaid and the underfed had hoped that the bill would improve their standard of living even if it brought no other benefits, but these poor creatures were doomed to disappointment. A parliament reformed as it ought to be would make corn and clothing cheap, but under the new measure there would be a perpetual corn law. In addition, Hunt attacked the £10 clause of the bill, which, he said, would deny the vote to all but one million of the eight million male adults living in the United Kingdom. The artisan was to be robbed of those coveted political rights which were to be granted henceforth to the small shopkeeper and his like. Last, but not least, Hunt ceaselessly demanded the ballot. To give a man the vote without the ballot, was, he declared, like "placing a rump of beef before him, and putting a knife and fork in his hands while not allowing him to eat it".

Hunt met with a cool reception from his colleagues immediately he dared to put forward his political ideas. His address to parliament on 12 April 1831 astounded and dismayed the supporters of the bill and was the joy of those who opposed it. The tories saw in Hunt's speech, with its strong criticism of the new measure of reform, a splendid piece of propaganda in support of their own cause, and, according to the *Morning Chronicle*, they printed it and sold it in the form of broadsheet, handbill, and placard. It was said that ten to twelve thousand copies of it were circulated throughout the country. It was even muttered in the House that Hunt's speech had done more for the cause of the anti-reformers than any speech yet delivered.

As a speaker, Hunt failed to sway the House as he swayed the crowds. It is true that he knew how to present a case with clarity, but he was never eloquent and far too often verbose. Who, indeed, can wonder that his remarks were so often interrupted by the coughs and laughter of the House when one reads the comments made by Mr. Alderman Waithman after listening to one of Hunt's harangues in 1831:

"The house had always listened to the hon. member for Preston with great attention who was often disposed to trouble them with matters relating to himself. He had been suffered on that occasion to state matters regarding himself

so fully, including the opinions and acts of his whole life that he trusted the house would be spared such harangues during the remainder of the session. The hon. member had spoken for twelve minutes the other night, and during that time the word 'I' occurred no less than seventy-five times!"

It must be said that during his two years' service in parliament, Hunt appeared to have achieved nothing. Every motion he put forward, every amendment he proposed, was rejected almost automatically. Nevertheless, even if his political aims seemed almost revolutionary during his lifetime, it is possible that he helped to create in Preston and South Lancashire a nucleus of radical thought and opinion—a useful heritage to future generations of working men who sought during the Chartist movement and the period of early trade unionism to build in England a true democracy.

#### IV THE ELECTION OF APRIL 1831

By April 1831 much had happened in government circles since Hunt first took his seat in parliament. The Grey government, which had come into power on the resignation of Wellington in December 1830, had immediately set to work to frame the reform bill which was introduced into parliament on 1 March 1831. After passing the second reading by a majority of only one vote, the bill was finally thrown out when the government was defeated in committee on an amendment proposed by the opposition. At Grey's earnest request, King William dissolved parliament, and after the dissolution came another general election. In Preston the two sitting candidates, Henry Hunt and John Wood, offered themselves for re-election. However, at a meeting of influential citizens who wished, as they said, "to remove from the town the stigma of having its interests represented by such a man as Hunt", three possible opponents were suggested, the Hon. E. G. Stanley, now M.P. for Windsor; Mr. Potter, M.P. for Wigan; and Mr. Charles Swainson, cotton manufacturer, of Walton-le-Dale. All three declined the invitation, Swainson replying curtly as follows: "Understanding that this election was to be conducted in the same manner as the last, and feeling that the issue would not depend upon a true majority of the electors, he must decline coming forward as a candidate." Eventually, the Preston whigs were successful in inducing Colonel de Lacy Evans to put up for the borough. Unfortunately, Evans found himself obliged to leave Preston almost immediately for Rye, to redeem a pledge that he would stand for that town if he were called upon to do so. His departure, was, in the end, somewhat of a relief to

the whigs and to some of the middle-class radicals, who had begun to fear that Evans's candidature might be a greater menace to Wood, whom they favoured, than to Hunt, whom they disliked. Wood and Hunt were therefore returned for the borough unopposed.

Shortly after this election a split occurred in the ranks of the Preston radicals. James Mitchell,<sup>(8)</sup> one of the most ardent radicals in the town, withdrew his support from Hunt, being angry that his leader should have voted in favour of the bill, which, in the long run, was destined to deprive Preston of the priceless privilege of universal adult male suffrage. Mitchell even went so far as to seek to replace Hunt at some future date by Cobbett as parliamentary candidate for the town. The quarrel must certainly have affected adversely Hunt's cause in Preston, especially as there were bitter recriminations on both sides, and the *Preston Chronicle*, week by week, delighted its readers with jubilant accounts of what it termed "Huntite Squabbles".

Writing of the state of the country at this crucial period in the history of England, Trevelyan says, "In 1830 the middle class, out for its rights against the tory aristocracy, was molten lava, a revolutionary flood, and below that roared the flame of a fiercer gulf of revolt, the desperation of starving peasants and operatives."<sup>(9)</sup> In Preston, however, though political feeling ran high, even finding its way into local administration, the town remained during the years 1830-1832 almost entirely at peace. The only serious incident provoked by the working-class radicals occurred in November 1831. It was quickly suppressed—the riots which followed being probably the work of hotheads and subversive forces. Though Hunt had visited the town during the previous week-end he was certainly not responsible for what happened, as he always warned his followers that it was wisest in their own interests to keep the peace. Shortly after Hunt's departure, however, certain of the radicals declared that they intended to hold a daylight meeting of the working men simultaneously with the expected union meetings in London and elsewhere. Having drawn up the six resolutions which they proposed to submit to their conference, they warned the mayor beforehand of their intention to "turn out" the

<sup>(8)</sup> James Mitchell owned a draper's shop in the town. Earlier in his career, he had been denounced at a meeting in York as an *agent provocateur* by Edward Baines, editor of the *Leeds Mercury*, who also exposed Oliver the Spy. At the election of December 1830, Hunt revealed that Mitchell was, in reality, merely one of Oliver's dupes, that he had received a light sentence, and had been kept in solitary confinement in Ilchester Gaol for a time.

<sup>(9)</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 237.

workers from the factories. The mayor, in his turn, issued a warning to the proprietors of the mills, some of whom decided to close their works for the day.

The *Preston Chronicle* reported that when the delegation arrived at the factories, their ranks had been swollen by "many strangers and others", and in some instances the premises were damaged and the managers maltreated. An attack made on the prison was foiled by the governor; finally, the mayor called in the military and quiet was restored. In the evening a meeting held on Gallows Hill outside the town dispersed peaceably after listening to an address given by John Taylor, Quaker cobbler and friend of Hunt, who warned the crowd that "ill-designing men wished them to disgrace themselves by imitating the rioters of Bristol and thus forward the ends of the whigs". The very fact that such an incident took place indicates that the working-class movement in Preston was growing in strength. In 1832, after much opposition from the other political parties in the town, they succeeded in forming a political union and founding the penny paper, 3730.

Nevertheless, a study of the public meetings held in the town between March 1831, when the reform bill was introduced into the Commons, and 7 May 1832, when the bill was thrown out by the Lords, would seem to lead to the conclusion that it was the middle-class radicals who formed the most forceful party in the borough. The wealthy and influential tories and whigs refrained from giving any public expression to their political theories, while the working-class radicals, with their lack of education, were for the most part unversed in the art of conducting an orderly meeting. Like Hunt and his followers, the middle-class radicals supported universal suffrage and the ballot; although for the time being they were willing to accept the bill as it stood on the principle that half a loaf was better than no bread, they hoped for a more extended franchise at some future date. However, they shrank from associating too closely with their working-class brethren, and many of them, being quiet and respectable folk, often hesitated to attend the public meetings which were organised in the town.

In fact, it was only when the bill was in peril that the middle-class reformers showed any signs of making common cause with Hunt and his party. In October 1831, however, they threw in their lot with the Huntites and signed an address to the king inviting him "not to create any more peers, but to issue his writs so as to obtain a parliament that would carry universal suffrage, annual parliaments and vote by ballot". In May 1832, when the fate of the bill hung in the balance, they actually

went so far as to agree to the formation of a political union which should draw its support from both the middle and lower classes. To their relief, Grey replaced Wellington as prime minister, and the political crisis seemed to be nearing its end. Thereupon the Preston middle-class radicals immediately severed their connection with their artisan brothers and found it convenient to forget that anything in the nature of a political union of the middle and lower classes had ever been mentioned in the town.

Meanwhile, since the riots of the previous year, peace and tranquillity had reigned within the precincts of the old borough, and the newspapers had carried no hint of any revolutionary activity. However, it is evident that this happy state of affairs might not have endured much longer, for immediately after Grey's return to power, Robert Segar, barrister and leader of the middle-class radicals, at an adjourned meeting held in the town let fall almost casually the remark, that "if circumstances had not fortunately taken a turn, he himself (as well as others) would have in all probability by this time been with arms in their hands". Whether the situation was indeed fraught with danger, we shall never know, for the bill had passed into law, the middle-class radicals were content, and the working-class party, dejected and probably apathetic, appear to have ceased publication of their paper 3730.

#### V THE ELECTION OF 1832

The great reform bill received the royal assent in June 1832. It was followed by the compilation of the first electoral register, and later by a general election in December of the same year. The new measure was not destined to rob Hunt of any of his constituents, as all the adult male inhabitants of Preston, with the exception of a mere 61 who were qualified under the £10 clause only, were included in the category of "ancient right" voters, and were permitted by a special clause inserted in the act to retain the franchise as long as they lived. Obviously framed partly with the intention of amending the act of 1828, the reform bill not only reduced the time allotted to the contest to a mere two days, but incidentally also greatly reduced the possibilities of fraud. The compilation of a register meant that the voters were already screened before the election began, and that the power of the chief returning officer, who in previous contests had been apt to give unfair decisions concerning disputed votes, was now swept away. Finally, the method of "district voting", on the lines of that adopted by Mr. Mounsey

in August 1830, was made statutory. Robbed of the power to manufacture spurious votes, and probably reluctant to offer either bribes or rewards in exchange for votes, the candidates and their supporters in the election of 1832 now sought other ways of gaining their ends, as the following account will show.

There were five candidates, Peter Hesketh Fleetwood, who went over to the opposing party about 1835, and was created a baronet in June 1838; the Hon. H. T. Stanley, younger brother of E. G. Stanley; Henry Hunt, the radical; Captain Forbes, R.N., also a radical, who agreed that he would support every measure that Hunt should propose in Parliament; and lastly Charles Crompton, a "liberal", son of the Dr. Crompton who contested Preston in 1812. He retired from the scene early in the election. Fleetwood, in spite of his tory label, was well received by a certain section of the working class, for his principles were liberal. He declared that his object as a politician was to promote the liberty, independence and comfort of all classes. He believed that the government should provide a good education for all at a reasonable cost, and gave his residence, Rossall Hall, in the Fylde, for use as a public school.

The Corn Exchange was now considered to be too small to be used any longer as a polling station. As at the last three elections, the town was divided into ten districts, but since some districts now contained more than the statutory number of 600 voters, each district was divided into two. Thus there were 20 polling places which were scattered about the town, and included several schools, a butcher's shop, two public houses, and a hairdresser's saloon. In each booth was to sit a deputy returning officer, armed with a copy of the electoral register. If an elector's name appeared on the list, he was allowed to tender his vote after answering the three simple questions required by the reform act. At Hunt's request, every voter was required to take the bribery oath.

The poll opened on Wednesday 13 December and by noon the town had become the scene of a running fight between the two political coalitions; the followers of Hunt and Forbes on the one hand, and the supporters of Stanley and Fleetwood on the other. Before 9 a.m. the Huntites had mustered in great strength at the different booths, "either with a view to prevent the other party from coming up or because they entertained a hope that an exhibition of strength at an early period of the election might influence voters on their behalf, and thus place their candidates at the head of the poll on the first day". The efforts of the Huntites were temporarily crowned with success, for it is said that at the Court House, not more than half a

dozen votes were enrolled for any of the candidates except Mr. Hunt and Captain Forbes until after midday, when Stanley and Fleetwood decided to retaliate. For this purpose they combined and despatched to the Court House a strong posse of constables and a number of rough brawny fellows wearing blue and orange worsted caps, and armed with long or short staves, who immediately attacked the offending Huntites with all their might. They were met with a volley of sticks, stones, brickbats and whatever missiles lay near to hand, but in the end they succeeded in gaining the ascendancy, so that, at long last, those who wished to vote for Fleetwood and Stanley obtained access to the polling booths. Skirmishes of this description took place between the contending parties throughout the first day of the poll, the Stanleyites and the Fleetwoodites finally carrying all before them in their "perambulations".

Towards two o'clock it became known that Fleetwood and Stanley were far ahead on the poll, and at dusk the Huntites decided to wreak their vengeance on their enemies. They broke the windows of the Weaver's Arms, where a party of their opponents were about to sit down to dinner; almost demolished the upper windows of the Bull Inn, where Stanley was staying; and then proceeded to the Castle Inn, which was Fleetwood's temporary resort. Here they shouted, cheered and yelled and then bombarded the place with sticks and stones, breaking not only the window glass but also the sashes, so that the next day the Inn looked as if it had been sacked and wrecked in a siege. The Huntites then managed to gain possession of the market place for a quarter of an hour but were driven off. However the mayor, in great alarm, read the riot act and then sent for the military, who arrived in the town from Chorley about midnight. On Thursday 13 December, the second day of the poll, the Huntite party was broken and dispirited, and towards noon scarcely a vote came up for Mr. Hunt. His defeat was decisive. Unfortunately peace did not descend immediately on the unhappy town, for the roughs employed by Stanley and Fleetwood were by this time the worse for liquor, and, being ripe for mischief, they launched attacks against two of the inns which were the favourite haunts of the Preston radicals. The mayor was obliged to read the riot act a second time and to call out the soldiery, after which the crowd soon dispersed. The final poll was as follows: Hesketh-Fleetwood, 3,372; Stanley, 3,273; Hunt, 2,054; Forbes, 1, 926; Crompton, 118.

After the election the "matchless orator" left the town for ever and retired from active politics. Whether Hunt would have

suffered so heavy a defeat if the act had allowed secret voting we cannot know. Yet there were signs that his star was already on the wane. A comparison of the poll books for 1832 and 1830 reveals that the number of mechanics who voted for him in 1830 fell by some 20% in 1832, while the number of spinners fell by 15%. These figures cannot be ignored, in spite of the fact that the 1830 poll book is suspect. Any attempts to seek an explanation of Hunt's declining popularity leads only to the wilderness of conjecture. All we can do, therefore, is to draw a bow at a venture, and suggest that both as a parliamentary representative and as a man Hunt had alienated the sympathies of some of the steady, thoughtful and respectable members of the working population. In the House of Commons, his influence, so far as we can judge, had been negligible, and in Preston itself his lack of dignity in public, his vainglorious boasting and the noise created by his followers whenever he visited the borough contrasted ill with the gentlemanly demeanour of a Stanley or a Fleetwood.

On the eve of the general election of 1834, it was suggested that Hunt should contest the Preston seat once again, but he refused, declining to assume further financial burdens. He died of paralysis in 1835 at the age of 62.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In addition to the authorities referred to in the text, I have consulted material in the Lancashire Record Office, including an unpublished thesis of James Aldridge, *The Parliamentary Franchise at Preston and the Reform Act of 1832* (1948). I wish to thank Mr. J. J. Bagley for much-needed criticism and advice, and the staff of the Lancashire Record Office (particularly Miss S. Tollit and Mr. A. N. Webb), Mr. R. F. Watson, F.L.A., Chief Reference Librarian of the Harris Public Library, and Miss H. Gibbon, Art Director and Curator of the Harris Museum, all of whom gave valuable assistance.