

THE DECLINE AND COLLAPSE OF THE NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS' UNION IN GLOUCESTERSHIRE 1887—96

PART II

by Nigel Scotland

1875 had witnessed a traumatic conflict within the National Union with two rival groups emerging, one continuing under Arch's leadership and the other siding with Matthew Vincent, who had been the National's treasurer and who was also the owner and editor of the *Labourers' Union Chronicle* which up until that point had been the principal mouthpiece of the movement. Arch demonstrated his natural charisma in that he was able to carry the majority with him through the crisis. However, although the bulk of the membership remained at Arch's side, the movement was never again able to regain the level of commitment which it had until the early months of 1875. In the first issue of the *English Labourer* Howard Evans gave his version of the quarrel. It appeared that there was a dispute in the *Labourers' Union Chronicle* Office in which Vincent alleged that Taylor caused some of his men to rebel against him and the recommendation of the Banbury district that the union ought to have more control over a paper which professed to support its interests. Vincent claimed that Taylor and not the Banbury district had prompted the putting of this resolution to the Conference. Another major point of contention was Taylor's claim that Vincent as editor abbreviated and altered his weekly notes to the union.¹

Vincent's 'New Land Union' held its inaugural meeting on Tuesday, 28 September, 1875. Notwithstanding the stormy surroundings of the meeting, there being considerable disturbances from the floor by Taylor and his supporting faction, the various speakers apparently 'carried the sympathies of the audience with them'.² No representatives from Gloucestershire were reported as taking an active part in the inaugural debates of the new union.

Arch's National Union held a special conference of delegates later in October of the same year 'for the purposes of defending themselves against the charges of reckless extravagance which have been preferred against the leaders from time to time.' A special report which had been drawn up by Mr Samuel Morley M.P. and others which substantiated the correctness of the previous year's balance was then read. The view presented by the report was that 'the charges regarding the misappropriation of funds and extravagant expenditure were unfounded'.³ Among the delegates who attended the National's special conference at Oxford was Henry Hemming, the Gloucestershire district secretary. During the discussions he forcibly put across the views of his district that in the future 'the Executive Committee should be composed of officers stationed in the district.'

RIVAL 'NATIONAL' FACTIONS IN GLOUCESTERSHIRE

Initially in Gloucestershire a number of branches felt warmly disposed towards Vincent and threw in their lot with his new rival 'National Farm Labourers' Union' which had come into existence in August 1875.⁴

One of the focal points of the National Union's internal struggles which had produced the rift in

question was the personal expenditure by the Union's full-time officials particularly some of those in executive positions such as the General Secretary, Henry Taylor. A number of Gloucestershire branches felt there was more than a ring of truth in these accusations. At the quarterly meeting held at Joseph Lenthall's premises in Cheltenham the district committee endeavoured not to take sides in this dispute, but a number of Gloucestershire branches nevertheless wrote to express their sympathies with Vincent and his new organisation. Among them were Brockhampton, Bourton-on-the-Water, Turkdean, Winchcombe, Quenington, North Cerney and Aston Cross.⁵

The new union laid heavy emphasis on a land policy. One of its stated aims was: 'To accelerate the solution of the land question by the purchase and hire of land so as to promote small holdings for the occupation and ownership of farm labourers.'⁶ The union sought to achieve this goal by forming a Land Company which would be able to hold land in trust. Members paid a weekly 1½d subscription towards a land share.⁷

In the event the new union did not hold a significant or long-lasting place in the affections of the Gloucestershire farm labourers. By the end of 1876 the support for Vincent's organisation was so diminished that he was forced to sell the paper to Arch's National Union and the Land Company appears to have collapsed at some point early in 1877. It was a time in which British agriculture generally and therefore wages were also declining and small holdings were not therefore a viable proposition.

By the early part of 1877, it appeared that many of the branches were returning to the fold of Arch's National. By the summer of the same year it was clear that almost all the Gloucestershire branches had rejoined Arch.

THE GLOUCESTERSHIRE DISTRICT OF THE N.A.L.U. IN THE AFTERMATH OF THE SPILT

On Wednesday, February 27 1877 the district was encouraged by a visit from President Joseph Arch. According to the *Wilts. and Gloucestershire Standard* of March 2 'a fairly well attended meeting' was held at the Temperance Hall, Cirencester for 'the consideration of the position of the National Agricultural Labourers' Union.' The chairman, Mr F. Goodrick stated in his introductory remarks that the union was making 'solid and satisfactory progress.'

Just over a month later the Gloucester district of the National met for their annual general meeting in the Temperance Hall, Cirencester. The district secretary, Henry Hemming reported an increase of about 250 members of the year.⁸ A slightly larger report of the same meeting carried by the *Stroud Journal* stated that the Gloucester Agricultural Union district had a membership of nearly 3,000.⁹ The *Chronicle* of July 14 listed forty-seven Gloucestershire branches which had sent in contributions for the period May 28 – June 30. Unfortunately there was no upward trend in the fortunes of Gloucestershire agricultural trade unionism.

There was a slow at first, but steady and sure decline in the life and work of the district which was all but complete within a decade. With the exception of the small cluster of branches in the extreme North West of the county most of which had been formed by William Yeats, the branches which remained were almost entirely on the Cotswold hills in the vicinity of Northleach and Cirencester in particular. Clearly the National in Gloucestershire took root in the labour intensive areas of arable farming. There were almost no branches in the Severn Vale, the reason being that the dairy farmers were less affected by the agricultural depression than the grain farmers of the hills.¹⁰ Wages on Cotswold farms in the 1880s and 90s averaged about 11s per week in summer whilst in the Vale in the same period they averaged about 14s. The South of the county appears to have been devoid of union agitation.

The 1878 Annual General Meeting of the district was held at the Sherborne Arms, Northleach on 1 March. In his address the district secretary showed that owing to a variety of causes 'we had not made that progress during the year which we could have wished'.

The year 1879 brought more dark clouds for the National Union. At the beginning of the year Alfred Arnold, Arch's major critic on the Union Executive, made a bid for the leadership. Once again money was proving to be the 'root of all evil' The *Chronicle* commented: 'It has never been our lot to witness so much confusion, jealousy, ill-behavior, or reckless waste of time.'¹²

It is clear that the vast majority of branches were solidly behind Arch in their loyalties. Nevertheless, yet another internal conflict and the resultant tension it created must have had the effect of weakening the men's confidence still further since the whole affair was made public in the *Wilts and Gloucestershire Standard* of 1 February, 1879. Hemming the district secretary, however, acted with caution and wanted to ensure that the majority of Gloucestershire branches were still committed to Arch. He summoned a meeting which took place at the Bell Inn, Cirencester, with 'Councillor' Lenthall presiding. Thirty-six out of the forty branches which had been circularised sent representatives. At the end of their deliberations, the following resolution which was somewhat cautious and guarded in tone was put and adopted by the membership: 'That this assembly of delegates believe that Mr Arch is entitled to the confidence of the agricultural labourers of England for the work already achieved, and whilst they trust he will retain his present position as President.'¹³

There were one or two encouragements during the early part of 1879. The district secretary was able to report that some men, at Leighterton, were getting 'one and in some cases two shillings per week more than they were at other places who are not in the union'.¹⁴ Early in June a successful tea and demonstration were held at Northleach attended by 260 people with a well-subscribed public meeting in the Congregational Chapel following. New branches were opened at several places including Ashbrook.¹⁵ But despite these brief moments of encouragement the overall downward trend had set.¹⁶ By the winter of the year a bleak picture was clearly visible even in Gloucestershire. In November Hemming reported that unionism in and around the neighbourhood of Lechlade is at 'a very low ebb' and that the farmers were 'threatening to lower the men's wages'. He was also forced the same month to report that the men of Dumbleton are in a 'very different state'.¹⁷

Throughout 1880 the downward trend continued and in the summer of 1881 Hemming found himself reporting that 'In many places now they are only getting 10s per week and unless they speedily make an effort to join the union they may look out to 9s after harvest'.¹⁸ Farm workers in various of the Cotswold villages had

evidently now begun to feel themselves under threat from the squirearchy and farmers. At Shipton Oliffe for example, although a good number were present at a branch meeting no-one could find a person who was willing to officiate as chairman.¹⁹

With their seeming inability to increase the membership, the district leadership began to marshal more of their energies into religious services and a campaign of active support for the extension of the franchise to the rural labourers. For example, Joseph Lenthall and Thomas Claridge conducted an evening service at Puesdown Pike. Claridge gave what the paper described as 'an excellent address on the dangers of putting off making our peace with God through Jesus Christ'. Afterwards Lenthall spoke on 'the advantages accruing to those who walk daily with God by confidence in Christ'. The Union paper also recounted services at Kemble Wick on the afternoon and evening of Sunday 27 August supported by 'The Primitive Methodist friends at Kemble' who gave up their own services to attend.²⁰

Throughout 1882 the Gloucester column of the union newspaper makes it clear that the men were beginning to feel more and more that their greatest hope lay in the campaign for the extension of the vote for farm workers. In April Hemming expressed his satisfaction that the men of South Cerney were 'taking up the franchise question' as were Kempsford and Marston Maisey branches.²¹ During the early part of 1883 there was a brief revival of interest as a number of Gloucestershire branch meetings discussed and made resolutions of support for Jesse Collings' 'Allotment Extension Act' which required the trustees of certain charities to announce every year that they were willing to let out their lands in parcels of not more than an acre to labourers and others. Jesse Collings, Liberal M.P. for Ipswich (1880—86) and Birmingham (1886—1918) championed demands for allotment land; he was a trustee of funds for the national union.

In the Spring and Summer months Joseph Arch made visits to Northleach and also to the hamlet of Brockhampton just a few miles to the north east of Cheltenham. In mid-June Arch was again in East Gloucestershire and delivered addresses at Ford, Puesdown and Kempsford. His impact must have been considerable as fifty-three men were reported as joining the union during the week.²² With two further visits from Arch in prospect in October and December, the hope was that the downward trend of the preceding years might at last be reversed. However, it was not to be; the year 1884 proved to be a lull before the onset of further decline in the history of Arch's union in Gloucestershire.

At the beginning of 1884 there was a mounting expectancy that the Franchise Bill which was designed to give the vote to a large section of rural labourers might meet with success and all districts of the union began to discuss the matter with great urgency and to fill in petitions and to pass resolutions in its favour. Hemming sent out petitions to all the Gloucestershire branches urging them to get all those they could in favour to sign and to forward them to Mr Gladstone or to some member of Parliament who would be likely to present them.²³ In July after the Lords had thrown out the 'Franchise Bill', a number of branches organised protest meetings. In that month Hemming noted in his district column of the union paper that the following motion was proposed and carried unanimously at Naunton, Ford, Clapton, Cold Aston and Coln Rogers.

That this meeting and others declares the action of the House of Lords in throwing out the Franchise Bill to be selfish and despotic on its part, and insulting to the House of Commons and to the Country.

Similar protest meetings were also reported at Oaksey, Tetbury, Kemble, East Leach, Turkdean and Compton Abdale.²⁴

THE COMING OF THE VOTE

After considerable struggles the Bill finally became law and the newly enfranchised Gloucestershire farm workers now flung themselves into a campaign of support for Arthur Brend Winterbotham (1837—92) the newly adopted Liberal candidate for Cirencester. Winterbotham's main election platform was continuing Free Trade and an urgent campaign of land for the labourer in the form of small-holdings. One of his favourite ploys was to hold up two loaves 'the little loaf' decorated with blue ribbon given them by the Tories and the big Free Trade loaf. Winterbotham was fully aware of the Gloucestershire farm labourers' desire for small-holdings and strongly advocated Joseph Chamberlain's 'Unauthorised Programme' and the promise of 'Three Acres and a Cow'.²⁵

Hemming was energetic in the Liberal cause and during the year his district column in the *English Labourers' Chronicle* gave details of the many branch meetings which he organised to explain the use of the ballot box to the labourers. Later in June and July several large public gatherings were organised, some of which were addressed by Arthur Winterbotham himself.²⁶

All this huge expenditure of energy on the part of Hemming and the union in support of the Liberal cause paid rich dividends as Winterbotham was returned with a majority of 74 votes. It was the first time the Tories had been dislodged for 43 years. Following this 'grand victory achieved by the labourers and their friends' Hemming ended the year 1885 writing in optimistic back-slapping tones: 'Go ahead, my lads, and all unite together in the common cause and victory in the future will assuredly be ours'.²⁷

As things turned out the new year didn't offer easy circumstances for keeping such resolutions. Many of the Tory squires, parsons and farmers were angered at the success of Arthur Winterbotham and numbers of them brought the labourers' wages down to 9s per week. By February Hemming reporting on the situation in the village of Clapton wrote: 'Much persecution is continued in this and other villages in this county in consequence of the men having voted for the Liberal candidate. Some of them have been kept out of work for weeks together.'

During the year 1887 Hemming suffered a period of ill health in which he was able to make little contribution to the work of the district. Following his recovery, the number of branch meetings recorded in the district were noticeably diminished. In 1888 there was very little in the *Chronicle* from Hemming's pen until March when he listed fifteen branches whose books he had audited.²⁸ Following this there was no further mention of Hemming whatsoever in the paper's Gloucestershire column. In September 1889 the *English Labourers' Chronicle* published a balance sheet of receipts and expenditure for the Gloucestershire district. It showed only seventeen active branches and of these only six had an income from receipts of £20 or over.²⁹ No activities from the Gloucestershire district were reported in the *Chronicle* at all for the year 1890. Thus Celia Miller wrote:

By 1891 the N.A.L.U. had sunk without trace in Gloucestershire and relations between farmer and farm workers had reached a state of quasi-compromise between the old order and the new, the workers still striving for higher wages and greater

freedom whilst clinging to the idea that their employers were under certain obligations not comprised in the pay.³⁰

Miller is not strictly correct in this assertion since the *Chronicle* of 28 May 1892 reported on the annual council of the N.A.L.U. which was held at the Steam Packet Hotel in Great Yarmouth. Among the delegates present was Thomas Ponting who represented Gloucestershire.³¹ There was also one further brief mention of Gloucestershire activities in the *Chronicle* of 4 May 1894. Thomas Ponting who had been branch secretary of Fairford in earlier days, reported twenty six members at Kempsford branch.

It would seem that the Gloucestershire district with the exception of this small pocket in the vicinity of Fairford and Kempsford, collapsed in 1889 which was a year of catastrophe for the National Union.

THE DECLINE OF THE N.A.L.U. IN GLOUCESTERSHIRE

The reasons for this slow but steady decline of Gloucestershire agricultural trade unionism from 1877 onwards are obviously diverse. Most of the factors which contributed to the downward trend of the movement nationally also affected its progress in Gloucestershire.

The last quarter of the nineteenth century was a period of agricultural depression which some observers were even prepared to term a 'Great Depression.' Its existence was eventually reluctantly acknowledged by the appointment of a Royal Commission on Agriculture in 1891. However the Commission wrongly assessed the situation as being caused by a series of poor harvests brought about by bad weather. The truth of the matter was the growth in the American grain trade and shipping facilities sharply depressed British wheat prices; farmers fell behind in their rent payments and large areas of land went out of cultivation. This was not the only problem with which British agricultural was forced to contend. In the same period the technique of sending frozen and chilled meat from Australia, New Zealand and South America was introduced, and so the British market had to cope with a further group of keen competitors.

The result of all this was that agricultural labourers' wages necessarily fell and depopulation of the countryside began in earnest. In Gloucestershire the average agricultural labourers' weekly wage fell from 14s. in 1876 to 12s. 6d. in 1898. In some Cotswold villages with union branches wages plummeted to as low as 9s. a week. Hemming's reaction to the situation was one of constant complaint against the men that 'they are prepared to remain outside the union and allow the farmers to reduce their wages.' But even had the farm workers continued to resist their falling wage levels, it is doubtful whether the farmers would have been able to meet their demands. With the steadily falling prices of their produce it became a necessity for most farmers to reduce the wage of their work force. The 'depression' undoubtedly had its toll on agriculture and agricultural trade unionism in Gloucestershire but it is important not to overplay its effects. Rider Haggard wrote: 'I am of the opinion that when compared with many other counties, the agricultural condition of Gloucestershire is not altogether unprosperous. Nor do the farmers seem to have lost hope of better days to come.'

Added to the depression in agriculture, the union had to cope with continued internal tensions and strife particularly at Executive level. The year 1889 which saw a slump in the fortunes of the Gloucester district and indeed of the National Union countywide, witnesses a major row over the use of sick benefit funds to pay union expenses. The result of this clash was that George



Delegates of the National Agricultural Labourers' Union signing a petition asking for the right to vote to be given to workers in the countryside.

Picture from the *Illustrated London News*, 3 June 1876.

Mitchell, Howard Evans, Jesse Collings and other leaders who had rendered much laudable service, severed their connections with the National Union from this point.

All these major struggles at national executive level inevitably filtered through to the districts and made the men distrustful or at the best doubtful about the union's capabilities. There can be no doubt that the collapse of the membership in all districts during 1889 was directly related to these events.

GLOUCESTERSHIRE DISTRICT LEADERS

Not only did the union lose leaders at the national level, it also lost significant local personalities at the district level. The first generation of Gloucestershire district union leaders were men of calibre and organisational ability whose leadership gave impetus to what in some quarters became a socio-religious crusade for better pay and conditions. Many of the union districts originated and died away in the hands of these men. Certainly this was the case in Gloucestershire where all the significant district leaders were prominently active in the ranks of non-conformity.

Henry Gwilliam (1843—1913) who was district secretary from 1872 — 74 appears to have been associated with the Cirencester Primitive Methodists and took part in a number of union Sunday services and camp meetings. Gwilliam was first a shopkeeper in Dollar Street³⁵ and later kept a restaurant.

Henry Hemming (1830—1909) who was district delegate from 1873 and Gwilliam's successor as secretary from 1874, was tireless in his union work and continued to take a very active part in the life of first the Cheltenham and then the Cirencester Primitive Methodist circuit. He spent his final years in the Stroud

area probably residing with his son who had moved in 1887.³⁶ Writing in the *Chronicle* of December 1885 Hemming stated that he had been accredited local preacher with the Primitive Methodists for over thirty years. In 1887 Hemming suffered a lengthy period of inactivity due to ill health.³⁷ The Minutes of the Cirencester Methodist Quarterly Meeting of the following month contain the following resolution: 'That Mr. Hemming have no appointments owing to the state of his health.' Thereafter he appears to have left Gloucestershire union work altogether. Certainly there is no further mention of his work in the *English Labourers' Chronicle*. Hemmings did however recover his health and in February 1894 among those who were appointed trustees of the chapel at Cirencester was 'Henry Hemming Cirencester—Greengrocer'.³⁸

Joseph Samuel Lenthall (1837—1907) a tailor and outfitter of High Street, Cheltenham was the union's district treasurer until 1879 and remained active in union affairs until the Parliamentary election of 1885. Like Hemming, he was an ardent non-conformist³⁹ and took an active part in preaching and organising camp meetings in the Cirencester and Cheltenham circuits. His expertise in financial matters proved invaluable in the administration of the agricultural union district. 'Councillor Lenthall' as he became known to the labourers was a very popular speaker who was frequently invited to address union tea meetings and anniversaries. Lenthall represented the Liberals for the North Ward seat of the new County Council. He does not appear to have had a disagreement with any of the Gloucestershire district officers but rather to have become progressively more involved in the Liberal campaigns of the mid 1880s. He took a prominent part in the Winterbotham election of 1885 and spoke at many of the meetings which the union organised on his behalf.

In 1877 the Gloucestershire district lost one of its greatest workers with the untimely death of Samuel Onley (1840-77) who was a member of the Union's National Consultative Council. Onley rendered the Gloucestershire district valuable service as district treasurer. He was a staunch Congregationalist and a gifted speaker and constant campaigner at the early meetings organised by the union in the villages of East Gloucestershire. According to the union paper, Onley's funeral was one of the most imposing demonstrations of respect ever witnessed in Cheltenham. The procession extended about three-quarters of a mile and those walking numbered at least 1,500. It may safely be computed that at least 20,000 witnessed the proceedings.

It was men of the calibre of Lenthall and Onley whom the union needed if it was to influence public opinion. Somehow the second generation officials of the Gloucester district were dwarfed by their predecessors.

Another factor which contributed to the decline of Gloucestershire agricultural trade unionism was its seeming inability to take root in the Vale. Had the union been able to achieve a stronger support in the towns and villages which bordered the River Severn it might have been possible to have effected more concerted demands for wage increases and improved conditions. However, the Vale dairy farms suffered less in the depression years than did the arable farms of the hills which were hit by falling grain prices and foreign competition. The dairy farmers even benefited to some extent from this since they were able to purchase cattle feed at reduced prices. Wage levels remained consistently higher in the Vale and there was therefore little incentive to the dairy men to join the union. Clearly the A.A.L.U. in Gloucestershire was a 'revolt of the field' and not a 'revolt of the dairy.'

Perhaps the factor which contributed to and marked the decline of Gloucestershire agricultural unionism was its merging with Liberal Party politics. This occurrence was a feature of most union districts but it seems to have been particularly prominent in Gloucestershire. In a sense the close association and interaction between

agricultural unionism and Liberal Party politics was to be expected as both movements had strong links with dissent and therefore an inbuilt distrust of the established church which depended for much of its income on the landed interest. In Gloucestershire the fact of the matter was that both Lenthall, the first union district Chairman, and Onley, the first union district treasurer, were already prominent in the organisation and work of the Gloucestershire Liberal Party. It was only natural that they should attempt to guide the new movement which they were instrumental in establishing in the tried paths of Liberalism. It's clear too that whilst Hemming held no official office in the Liberal Party either before or after the emergence of the 'revolt of the field,' he became increasingly convinced of the need to be totally committed to Liberal Party politics. A very high percentage of the union meetings he organised in 1885 were in support of the Liberal candidates in the forthcoming General Election. But in setting the farm workers' aspirations almost entirely on the Liberal Party objective the union lost its own distinctiveness. Many Gloucestershire labourers having seen A.B. Winterbotham safely to the House of Commons felt that they could leave matters there. Furthermore Winterbotham was as active in the labourers' cause as Hemming and the union had been and between 1885 and 1892 he bought up a substantial acreage of land and set up small holdings for the use of agricultural labourers. It was probably the case that many labourers felt their new Member of Parliament could achieve as much or more on their behalf as the union had done or could hope to do in the future. Thus the emotional energy and action of the farm labourers began to be directed into a channel which flowed away from agricultural unionism.

In the light of these factors the rural labourers could perhaps be forgiven for complacently resting on their laurels and allowing their union to slip away silently into oblivion. All traces of its existence in Gloucestershire were gone by 1896. Thus for more than a decade the county was without agricultural union activity.

1. *English Labourer* 26 June 1875
2. *ibid*
3. *Labourers' Union Chronicle* 30 October 1875
4. *ibid* 28 August 1875
5. *ibid* 3, 10, 17, 24 July, 7 August, 4 September 1875
6. *ibid* 24 July 1875
7. *National Agricultural Labourers' Chronicle* 17 June 1876
8. *Wilts and Gloucester Standard* 21 April 1877
9. *Stroud Journal* 21 April 1877
10. It was the grain farmers of the Cotswolds who were hit by the imports of cheap wheat from America and Canada. The market for dairy produce remained relatively stable.
11. *Stroud Journal* 1 February 1879
12. *ibid*
13. *ibid* 15 February 1879
14. See for example the county report in *Stroud Journal* 8 March 1879
15. *ibid* 2 June 1879. See also the report in *Wilts and Gloucestershire Standard* 7 June 1879, 11 October, 5 July 1879
16. *English Labourers' Chronicle* 20 September 1879
17. *ibid* 8, 24 November 1879
18. *ibid* 18 June 1881
19. *ibid* 4 March 1882
20. *ibid* 5 August, 2 September 1882
21. *ibid* 29 April 1882
22. *ibid* 16 June 1883. For a full account of Arch's address at North-leach on 14 May see *Wilts and Gloucestershire Standard* 20 May 1883
23. *ibid* 23 March 1883
24. *English Labourers' Chronicle* 26 July 1884, 16 August 1884
25. *Cheltenham Free Press* 28 November, 5 December 1885
26. See for example *English Labourers' Chronicle* 14, 28 February, 7, 14 March 1885 see Meeting at Sapperton *Wilts and Gloucestershire Standard* 20 June 1885 and the meeting at Birdlip *Stroud Journal* 12 September 1885
27. *ibid* 12 December 1885
28. *ibid* 2 January, 27 February 1886, 17, 19 March 1887
29. *ibid* 21 September 1889
30. Miller, C., *Farming, Farm Work and Farm Workers in Victorian Gloucestershire* (Unpublished PhD, thesis, University of Bristol, 1980)
31. *English Labourers' Chronicle* 28 May 1892
32. In 1882 Hemming reported that men in the Turkdean area were working for as little as 10s per week. *English Labourers' Chronicle* 25 February, 11 October 1884
33. Haggard, R., *Rural England* 1906, p.402. Haggard was referring to the county as a whole and the Vale clearly did not suffer in the same way as did the Cotswolds
34. Groves, R., *Op Cit* p.83
35. Cirencester Cemetery burial registers indicate that Henry Gwilliam died 17 May 1913 aged 70 years. He was buried in the same 'non-conformist' grave as his wife Elizabeth who died 6 January 1915 aged 67 years. Elizabeth Gwilliam appears on class lists of the Cirencester Primitive Methodist Chapel. See Kelly *Gloucester Directory* 1874 Gwilliam, H., Pork Butcher, Dollar Street
36. *Labourers' Union Chronicle* 8 February 1873, The Cirencester Primitive Methodist Quarterly Meeting Minutes have the following entries, 28 February 1886 'Letter of sympathy to Bro. Hemming's wife in her affliction'. 30 May 1901, 'Credentials of Bro. Hemmings to be sent to the Stroud Circuit, he having gone there to reside'. See also 7 March 1887 'Bro. Hemming junior be credentialed to the Stroud Circuit.
37. *English Labourers' Chronicle* 29 January 1887, 12 March 1887
38. *Cirencester Primitive Methodist Quarterly Meeting Minutes* 9 June 1890, 26 February 1894
39. See his obituary *Cheltenham Free Press & Cotswold News* 27 April 1907 'Claiming descent on the paternal side from speaker Lenthall of Cromwellian days and on the maternal side from the Havards, a Huguenot family who settled in Somersetshire. . .'