

# Creating a Port: Liverpool 1695–1715

*Michael Power*

## I

Towns are usually thought to develop slowly. The advance of trade or industries, the growth of population, the emergence of hinterlands, all take time. The histories of the economic growth of towns emphasize the long term. While acknowledging the general truth of this view, it is clear that the pace of urban economic expansion is not always slow. Towns do experience periods of accelerated growth in particular circumstances. Newcastle reacted to the demand for coal from London in the sixteenth century; Bristol emerged in the seventeenth century as a major Atlantic port; Glasgow grew rapidly in the eighteenth century on the profits of New World tobacco and Lanarkshire coal.<sup>1</sup> Sometimes development can be more rapid still when provoked by a particular stimulus. It is argued in this paper that a charter granted to Liverpool in 1695 provided just such a boost to the town. It established a council which actively promoted political, ecclesiastical, and economic improvement, and is notable for building a pioneering wet dock.<sup>2</sup> This important external economy encouraged the overseas trade of the port and in the

<sup>1</sup> S. Middlebrook, *Newcastle-upon-Tyne: its growth and achievement* (Newcastle, 1950), chapter 1; D. H. Sacks, *The widening gate: Bristol and the Atlantic economy, 1450–1700* (Berkeley, CA, 1991), pp. 197–204, 218, 252–65; G. Jackson, 'Glasgow in transition c. 1660–c. 1740', and T. M. Devine, 'The golden age of tobacco', in *Glasgow, I: beginnings to 1830*, ed. T. M. Devine and G. Jackson (Manchester, 1995), *passim*.

<sup>2</sup> I am indebted to the Leverhulme Trust for a grant for work, with Dr D. Ascott and Dr F. Lewis, on 'The Liverpool community 1660–1750', which enabled much of the work on which this paper is based. For the charter of 1695 see R. Muir and E. M. Platt, *History of municipal government in Liverpool to 1835* (Liverpool, 1906), pp. 110–14, 247–54.

early decades of the eighteenth century the town began to rival Bristol in commercial importance.<sup>3</sup>

The activity of the new council after 1695 built on the often remarked locational advantages of Liverpool. The port's proximity to Ireland and ready access to the Atlantic meant that it was well placed to carry western trade.<sup>4</sup> Its remoteness from France gave it a relative freedom from privateering during times of war, though at some periods the hazard was real enough. Most important, its hinterland provided valuable raw materials, coal and salt, and increasingly—as river and canal improvements were made in the eighteenth century—manufactures from the Manchester region, the Staffordshire potteries, the West Riding woollen industry, and even the Midlands.<sup>5</sup> Against this favourable background, political action and commercial enterprise acted as a catalyst for the town's rapid development from a small town to a major entrepôt.

The charter of 1695 vested political power in the hands of a small group of merchants who demonstrated remarkable cohesion. They shared a common commercial interest in trade of enormous potential with Ireland, Virginia, and the West Indies, and intelligence about commodities, ships, ports, and privateers. Some were bound by family ties and others by friendship and affection. They also co-operated in developing the town. The establishment of a parish for the first time in 1699, planning for the redevelopment of the castle site after 1704, building the dock between 1709 and 1715, and leasing land for the first major expansion of the town on the old heath were their most notable initiatives in the reigns of William III and Queen Anne.<sup>6</sup> The period was a turning point, when the course was set for the town's eighteenth-century development.

<sup>3</sup> K. Morgan, *Bristol and the Atlantic trade in the eighteenth century* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 133, 143–4.

<sup>4</sup> J. de Vries, *European urbanisation 1500–1800* (London, 1984) pp. 136–42.

<sup>5</sup> W. Enfield, *An essay towards the history of Liverpool drawn up from papers left by the late Mr George Perry and from other materials since collected by William Enfield* (London, 1773), pp. 67–90. The inland trade of eighteenth-century Liverpool has been better covered than overseas trade and is not the focus of this paper: see T. Barker, 'Lancashire coal, Cheshire salt and the rise of Liverpool', *T.H.S.L.C.* CIII (1951), pp. 83–101; J. Langton, 'Liverpool and its hinterland in the late eighteenth century', in *Commerce, industry and transport: studies in economic change on Merseyside*, ed. B. Anderson and P. Stoney (Liverpool, 1983), pp. 1–25.

<sup>6</sup> Liv. R.O., 352 MIN/COU 1/7, ff. 31, 46, 53 (Liverpool town books), for these and other developments.

## II

Before 1695 the corporation demonstrated little cohesion or autonomy. The town was much influenced by neighbouring land-owners, the earls of Derby, Viscounts Molyneux, and the Moore family of Bank Hall.<sup>7</sup> It invariably accepted the earl of Derby's nominees for its members of parliament.<sup>8</sup> Moreover, in the politically uncertain relations between Restoration government and towns, Liverpool lost what independence it had as a result of a charter of 1677 which added fifteen outsiders to the council, gentlemen who were intended to guarantee a pro-court corporation.<sup>9</sup> The townsmen who served on the late seventeenth-century council were a mixed group, with craftsmen, merchants, and mariners in roughly equal proportions.<sup>10</sup> Such a variety of interests perhaps inhibited a corporate will. The town certainly played a limited role in political events like the Exclusion Crisis of 1679–81.<sup>11</sup> Nor did the corporation take any significant measures to improve the port at a time when town merchants were beginning to engage in transatlantic trade.<sup>12</sup>

The charter of 1695 fundamentally changed the situation. It was granted in the wake of an election fraud perpetrated by Mayor Alexander Norres in December 1694, when he returned Thomas Brotherton, the Tory candidate for M.P., who had polled 15 votes, instead of Jasper Maudit, the Whig candidate, who had polled 400. The town Whigs petitioned for a new charter, and William III issued

<sup>7</sup> Investigated thoroughly by M. Mullett, 'The politics of Liverpool, 1660–88', *T.H.S.L.C. CXXIV* (1972), pp. 31–56.

<sup>8</sup> *History of parliament: the House of Commons, 1660–90*, ed. B. D. Henning, I (London, 1983), pp. 288–90.

<sup>9</sup> J. Miller, 'The crown and the borough charters in the reign of Charles II', *E.H.R. C* (1985), pp. 57–79; Muir and Platt, *Municipal government in Liverpool*, pp. 105, 191–203; M. Power, 'Politics and progress in Liverpool, 1660–1740', *Northern History*, XXXV (1999), p. 122.

<sup>10</sup> M. Power, 'Councillors and commerce in Liverpool, 1650–1750', *Urban History*, XXIV (1997), p. 311.

<sup>11</sup> Compare the lively politics in Bristol: J. Barry, 'The politics of religion in Restoration Bristol', in *The politics of religion in Restoration England*, ed. T. Harris, P. Seaward, and M. Goldie (Oxford, 1990), pp. 164–79.

<sup>12</sup> P. Clemens, 'The rise of Liverpool, 1665–1750', *Econ. H.R.* 2nd ser. XXIX (1976), pp. 211–25; C. N. Parkinson, *The rise of the port of Liverpool* (Liverpool, 1952), pp. 53–64.



it in August, naming an elderly Whig merchant, Thomas Johnson, as mayor, together with forty councillors.<sup>13</sup> Behind the royal expressions of affection in the charter lay an awareness of the strategic importance of Liverpool as a port. In April 1689 Liverpool had been used to embark regiments under Major-General Kirk and Sir Thomas Hanmer for Londonderry, and the co-operation of the town was a recent memory.<sup>14</sup>

The charter of 1695 put new men in charge of the town. All twenty-five councillors listed as attending the first meeting in 1697 at which a roll was called were newcomers. None had appeared in 1694, the last council before the charter when councillors were listed. All the new men were townsmen, not outsiders. Moreover, they included a greater proportion of merchants than before 1695. In the decade before the charter there were few identifiable merchant councillors, only two in 1687 for example. By 1697 there were eight; a decade later (in 1708) there were some fourteen, together with twelve who, though not described as merchants, engaged in overseas trade. Traders had quickly become the majority interest on the council.<sup>15</sup> Their rise was helped by a clause in the charter of 1677, confirmed in 1695, requiring mayors, bailiffs, and councillors to be chosen by the council rather than the freemen. The council thus co-opted new members.<sup>16</sup> The merchant councillors of 1695 recruited business friends, and a narrow governing group developed which lasted until reform in 1835. It is not surprising, of course, to find an oligarchical town government dominated by merchants, for that was the norm in eighteenth-century towns.

<sup>13</sup> Muir and Platt, *Municipal government in Liverpool*, pp. 109, 249; James Touzeau, *The rise and progress of Liverpool from 1551 to 1835* (Liverpool, 1910), p. 339; Liv. R.O., 352 CLE/TRA 2/6, ff. 158-9 (T. N. Morton's transcripts of Liverpool town books).

<sup>14</sup> *Calendar of state papers, domestic, 1689-90*, pp. 48, 80-1.

<sup>15</sup> An attempt was made to build a database of councillors from Liverpool town books, their occupations from parish registers and probate records, and their overseas trade activity from a port book of 1708-9, the year when the council decided to build a dock: Liv. R.O., 352 MIN/COU 1/4-8; L.P.R.S. XXXV, CI (Liverpool parish registers); R.S.L.C. XVIII, XX (probate index); P.R.O., E 190/1375/08 (port book). The database of councillors (TOWNBOOK) and the port book (PBGLC-09) are deposited in 'The Liverpool community 1660-1750' at the Data Archive at the University of Essex. I am grateful to Dr Ascott and Dr Lewis for use of their computerized lists of registers and wills.

<sup>16</sup> Muir and Platt, *Municipal government in Liverpool*, pp. 111-13, 202, 248-9.

However, the sudden shift towards mercantile oligarchy in Liverpool in 1695 is distinctive.<sup>17</sup>

The takeover of power led to a degree of political unity unusual in towns at this time. Commercial, religious, and political issues commonly divided town societies in the reigns of William III and Queen Anne, and worked against co-operation.<sup>18</sup> Competing commercial and financial interests within larger cities like London and Bristol did not exist in Liverpool.<sup>19</sup> Religious conflict over the problem of dissent was an even more potent cause of discord in some towns. In Liverpool, religious differences between councillors remained muted after the 1662 Corporations Act which purged the council of dissenters, who did not thereafter challenge Anglican hegemony as they did in London and Bristol.<sup>20</sup> Though dissenters lived and worked in the town, there is little evidence of wide-ranging animosity to them. The prevailing attitude seems to have been one of tolerance.<sup>21</sup>

There were certainly political differences in the age of 'the rage of party', and councillors identified themselves as Whig or Tory.<sup>22</sup> On

<sup>17</sup> Compare, for example, 80 per cent of merchant councillors in Bristol, 'almost all' in Hull, 45 per cent in Exeter, and 52 per cent in Glasgow: Sacks, *Widening gate*, pp. 165–6; G. Jackson, *Hull in the eighteenth century* (London, 1972), p. 308; Robert Newton, *Eighteenth-century Exeter* (Exeter, 1984), p. 38; I. Maver, 'Guardianship of the community', in *Glasgow, I*, ed. Devine and Jackson, chapter 7.

<sup>18</sup> T. Harris, *Politics under the later Stuarts: party conflict in a divided society, 1660–1715* (London, 1993), pp. 119–28, 152–6, 180–1, 187–91; J. V. Beckett, 'Introduction: stability in politics and society 1680–1750', in *Britain in the first age of party, 1680–1750: essays presented to Geoffrey Holmes*, ed. C. Jones (London, 1987), p. 5.

<sup>19</sup> Nothing like the financial interest associated with the Bank of England and National Debt, or merchant rivalries between the Old East India and New East India Companies existed, for example: H. Horvitz, 'Party in a civic context: London from the exclusion crisis to the fall of Walpole', in *Britain in the first age of party*, ed. Jones, pp. 181–7; G. de Krey, *A fractured society: the politics of London in the first age of party, 1688–1715* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 14–32; Sacks, *Widening gate*, pp. 197–218.

<sup>20</sup> Liv. R.O., 352 MIN/COU 1/3, pp. 139–41; for religious divisions elsewhere: Barry, 'Politics of religion in restoration Bristol', *passim*; Horvitz, 'Party in a civic context', pp. 181–7; de Krey, *Fractured society*, pp. 14–32.

<sup>21</sup> For evidence of religious differences, see Liv. R.O., 352 CLE/TRA 2/8, ff. 138–44; for data on dissenters in Liverpool see History of Parliament unpublished paper, 'Liverpool elections 1690–1715', for which I thank Richard Harrison and acknowledge the History of Parliament copyright; for toleration, *The Norris papers*, ed. T. Heywood, C.S. [old ser.] IX (1846), pp. 79–82.

<sup>22</sup> For an analysis of party affiliation in Liverpool, Richard Harrison, 'Liverpool elections 1690–1715' (History of Parliament unpublished paper) is an authoritative

the council which decided to build a dock in 1708, Thomas Johnson the younger and Richard Norris, the town's M.P.s, were staunch Whigs. Johnson had been a leading Whig in the group which petitioned for the new charter in 1695, and was made first mayor.<sup>23</sup> Richard Gildart, William Squire, and John Cockshut shared his politics. Whiggism, coloured in Liverpool by enthusiasm for the new charter of 1695, was the political stance of most councillors.<sup>24</sup> A minority, including John Cleivland, John Earle, George Tyrer, and Foster Cunliffe, were Tories or supporters of the old charter of 1677. Though such party labels led to some lively electioneering in the period, particularly in mayoral contests in 1702, 1703, and 1705, political differences were not bitter.<sup>25</sup> A Whig M.P. like Thomas Johnson seemed to get on as well at Westminster with a Tory partner, William Clayton, from 1701 as he did with a Whig partner, Richard Norris, from 1708. A predominantly Whig council in 1703 pressed John Cleivland to serve as mayor, despite his Tory convictions. As Thomas Johnson remarked, 'we must not be angry with one another that we differ in judgement'.<sup>26</sup> That injunction seems to have been generally observed as councillors of different political convictions worked together. Halliday has recently argued that political animosity was exacerbated by successive purges of town corporations from the Restoration onwards, Tory and Whig opposing each other ever more fiercely with the memory of past wrongs.<sup>27</sup> Liverpool may have benefited from its relatively subdued experience of partisan politics in the late seventeenth century.

Consensus was allied to increasing political sophistication. The new councillors quickly became used to the way politics were played at Westminster. Whereas a previous generation had relied on the aid of great lords, like the earl of Derby, to use their influence in London on the town's behalf, the new council represented itself. Jasper Maudit spent much time between 1696 and 1699 in London representing the

guide and acknowledgement is made to the History of Parliament copyright. See also Power, 'Politics and progress in Liverpool', pp. 129-33.

<sup>23</sup> *Norris papers*, pp. 25-9.

<sup>24</sup> For Whig takeover see Muir and Platt, *Municipal government in Liverpool*, pp. 109-15, 249; Liv. R.O., 352 CLE/TRA 2/6, pp. 156-7, 160.

<sup>25</sup> *Norris papers*, pp. 95, 99-100, 131, 143-5.

<sup>26</sup> *Norris papers*, pp. 89-91.

<sup>27</sup> P. D. Halliday, *Dismembering the body politic: partisan politics in England's towns, 1650-1730* (Cambridge, 1998), p. 277.



corporation in a legal dispute with the London cheesemongers.<sup>28</sup> Members of Parliament, usually drawn from the council, sought private Acts for town improvements.<sup>29</sup> William Clayton and Sir William Norris, for example, procured the Act for the creation of a parish of Liverpool; Sir Thomas Johnson and Richard Norris the Act for the dock. Supporting strategy included the publication of position papers, as in the *Case of the corporation of Liverpool to support the Bill for a parish*.<sup>30</sup> It was an age when corporations were becoming used to pursuing municipal improvement via statute.<sup>31</sup>

Liverpool was no doubt helped by the London connections of the Norris family of Speke, which was central to the Whig network in the town. Richard Norris regularly visited his mother Katharine, the daughter of a London merchant family, living at Albemarle Street in Westminster at this period.<sup>32</sup> He also stayed with the London merchants Alexander and Henry Cairnes.<sup>33</sup> He recommended Liverpool friends to stay with Henry Watts, landlord of the Axe Inn in Aldermanbury. Foster Cunliffe was one councillor whom the landlord described on 14 September 1706 as 'good company', and the inn became a Liverpool home from home in the capital, where the company laid bets on the progress of war on the Continent.<sup>34</sup> The new merchant councillors quickly acquired metropolitan and parliamentary confidence.

The advantage of this experience was obvious in the strategy for building a dock. Plans were mooted in Liverpool in 1707. Thomas Johnson reported on 27 January that George Sorocold, 'a very ingenious man', had suggested using stone from the castle to construct the dock. William Bibby, Edward Litherland, and Thomas Ackers proposed a scheme to construct a canal in the

<sup>28</sup> S. Handley, 'Local legislative initiatives for economic and social development in Lancashire, 1689–1731', *Parliamentary History*, IX (1990), pp. 34–6; Touzeau, *Rise and progress of Liverpool*, pp. 331–3.

<sup>29</sup> The M.P.s were Jasper Maudit, William Norris, William Clayton, Thomas Johnson, Richard Norris, and John Cleivland: unpublished paper on 'Liverpool elections 1690–1715'. I acknowledge the History of Parliament copyright.

<sup>30</sup> Touzeau, *Rise and progress of Liverpool*, p. 342; Handley, 'Local legislative initiatives', pp. 19–21; *Norris papers*, pp. 128–30.

<sup>31</sup> P. Gauci, *Politics and society in Great Yarmouth, 1660–1722* (Oxford, 1996), p. 258.

<sup>32</sup> For example, in Oct. 1703, Edward Norris writes to Richard at Lady Norris's: Liv. R.O., 920 NOR 2/579 (Norris papers).

<sup>33</sup> Liv. R.O., 920 NOR 1/288.

<sup>34</sup> Liv. R.O., 920 NOR 2/579; *Norris papers*, pp. 154–8.

Liver Pool to improve access for ships in April 1709. The crucial initiative came in a vote of the council on 3 November 1708 which directed Thomas Johnson and Richard Norris, the M.P.s, to treat with a proper person to come to the town to design a dock.<sup>35</sup> They engaged Thomas Steers of London, whose idea for an enclosed wet dock was adopted. In October 1709 the M.P.s were ordered to obtain an Act of Parliament to raise funds for the work. By May 1710 the Act was passed and Thomas Steers was formally engaged.<sup>36</sup> On 17 May the council nominated the mayor, bailiffs, aldermen, and councillors as trustees for the dock, for the preservation of 'all merchant ships but also of her majesty's ships of war'. The site was staked out and work begun. Ralph Peters, the new town clerk, was entrusted to keep a book of orders relating to the project.<sup>37</sup>

The dock was built in the Liver Pool, which lay between the old town and the town common, and thus promoted the growth of the town in that direction. Building leases on common land next to the proposed dock were granted by the corporation throughout 1707 and 1708. Robert Litherland petitioned for 30 yards of land at 8*d.* a yard on 20 August 1707, 'across the Pool', and Thomas Hurst for 60 yards fronting the street and 20 yards backing on to the water, to build on within seven years. Robert Southerby, ship's carpenter, petitioned for 8 yards next to Litherland's lease. On 8 October leases were granted to John Wainwright and Thomas Pattison, and on 21 October leases were petitioned for by John Seacombe and Thomas Anyon. The process continued in the following year. In February 1708 James Gibbons petitioned for a lease near Richard Clayton's ropery near the Pool. Most significant Thomas Thomas petitioned in May for a way from Pool Lane to link the old town to the common, where the new leases were located, by way of a bridge over the Liver Pool. Richard Norris viewed the site and the corporation decided to pay for construction of the road in July 1708. The proposed access route encouraged further leases: in July 1708 to Mr Henry Richmond for a close and barn 'across the Pool' and on 16 August to Robert Wilson for a ropewalk at the lower end of the new way from Pool Bridge. In November, land near by was leased to John Turner near the new church of St Peter, and to Henry Currain

<sup>35</sup> *Norris papers*, p. 165; Liv. R.O., 352 MIN/COU 1/8, p. 26.

<sup>36</sup> Touzeau, *Rise and progress of Liverpool*, pp. 379–80, 385.

<sup>37</sup> Liv. R.O., 352 MIN/COU 1/8, f. 51.



'over the Pool'.<sup>38</sup> Richard Norris and Mrs Cockshut, widow of Alderman Cockshut, were planning to build in the same area in September and November 1710.<sup>39</sup> A new suburb across the Pool was fast taking shape.

The projected cost of the dock, £6,000, made the annual corporation income of less than £400 per annum look puny.<sup>40</sup> On 3 April 1710 £1,200 was raised at interest on the security of the rents and hereditaments of the corporation: £300 to pay 'several workmen'; £100 to repay the cost of obtaining the Act; £600 to repay Mrs Isabel Baynes; and £200 to repay Mr Minshull. On the following day John Earle, Thomas Johnson, and Richard Norris borrowed a further £200 from Mrs Sarah Deane. By 19 January 1711 interest was also being paid on £1,500 borrowed from Mr Wilson of Dallam Tower in Westmorland. On 7 February 1711 £400 was borrowed from George Bowyer, John Markland, Alexander Leigh, and Richard Heys of Wigan, and on 19 February a further £400 from Mr John Burrow of Warrington and Mr Koquin of Wigan. By 8 October 1712 the debts of the corporation were 'said to become very great' and the townsmen who acted as sureties were relieved of other obligations to the town.<sup>41</sup> The total borrowed amounted to over ten times the corporation's annual income.<sup>42</sup>

Building the dock was a major financial enterprise, but the problem of its cost united the council and drove it to more inventive ways of exploiting corporation assets for immediate cash. On 8 October 1712 the prisage of wines, an impost on imported wine, was earmarked to service the accumulating debt. From that date, too, fines for admission to the freedom were dedicated to pay the debt, a large number, 235, being collected in the following year.<sup>43</sup> At the same time the corporation encouraged all its tenants to extend their three-life leases by an additional twenty-one years, in return for a suitable fine. Some fifty-five revised leases issued in the following

<sup>38</sup> Liv. R.O., 352 MIN/COU 1/8. No pagination visible but the dates of leases locate them.

<sup>39</sup> Liv. R.O., 352 MIN/COU 1/8, ff. 56v., 57.

<sup>40</sup> Muir and Platt, *Municipal government in Liverpool*, p. 118.

<sup>41</sup> Liv. R.O., 352 MIN/COU 1/8, ff. 49–50, 63, 63v., 79.

<sup>42</sup> J. Longmore, 'Liverpool corporation as landowners and dock builders, 1709–1835', in *Town and countryside: the English landowner in the national economy, 1660–1860*, ed. C. W. Chalklin and J. R. Wordie (London, 1989), pp. 116–22.

<sup>43</sup> Liv. R.O., 352 MIN/COU 1/8, ff. 79, 90–1.

six months, in 1712–13, raised over £2,000.<sup>44</sup> On 7 April 1714 the new leasing policy was targeted at developers who wanted to build on adjoining land to raise money to finish the dock.<sup>45</sup> On 4 June 1714 the mayor was instructed to mortgage the Shambles to raise £600 more.<sup>46</sup> By such means the corporation sought to cover the unexpectedly high costs of construction. The challenge of building the dock was a revealing test of the political unity and nerve of the council. Despite the challenge to the charter of 1695 by Henry Richmond, the Tory rector, in July 1712, unity was maintained.<sup>47</sup> Once embarked on so bold a project the council pushed it forward to completion.

In the long run the dock more than paid for its construction cost through the dock dues charged on traders entering the jurisdiction of the port, an area encompassing the whole Mersey estuary. Though this right had been successfully challenged in 1699 by the London cheesemongers (who, as freemen of London, claimed exemption from Liverpool port dues when they loaded their boats with Cheshire cheese up river at Ince and Frodsham), the dock Bill reasserted Liverpool's right to collect them. Strengthened by the example of Acts for pier repairs at Dover, Whitby, and Yarmouth, which confirmed the right of corporations to impose dues, the Act of 1709 gave Liverpool corporation the power to exact dues from any trader entering the Mersey.<sup>48</sup>

Balancing the books did, however, take several years. In 1720 there was still unease about the financial management of the dock, for a complaint was made that a small group had sold the dock to themselves.<sup>49</sup> Five years later the gamble was paying off. Silvester Moorcroft built a new custom house in 1726 at the head of the dock to replace the old custom house on Water Street. The enterprise was proving the most successful initiative of the new

<sup>44</sup> Only thirteen of the fifty-five note the fine, amounting together to £642; at the same rate the total would have been £2,716: Liv. R.O., 352 MIN/COU 1/8, ff. 81–7.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid. f. 105.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid. f. 108.

<sup>47</sup> Richmond's motives probably had more to do with defending the town against dissenters in the wake of the Sacheverell case than with the dock enterprise. Thomas Johnson, Jasper Maudit, Richard Norris, and an attorney were empowered to defend the corporation: Liv. R.O., 352 MIN/COU 1/8, ff. 78–9.

<sup>48</sup> Touzeau, *Rise and progress of Liverpool*, pp. 331–3; Handley, 'Local legislative initiatives', pp. 34–6.

<sup>49</sup> Touzeau, *Rise and progress of Liverpool*, p. 382.

corporation, a unique facility for a port in Britain.<sup>50</sup> The commissioning of Thomas Steers on 11 January 1738 to build a second dock testified to the commercial success of the 'old dock', as it came to be known, and the course was set for the massive expansion of the port.<sup>51</sup>

### III

The council which decided to build the dock in 1708 was dominated by merchants, twenty-six of its forty-one members being heavily engaged in overseas trade. They carried an average of eighteen consignments a year in 1708–9 compared to the average of six carried by all Liverpool merchants. Moreover, merchant councillors were heavily involved in transatlantic trade, three quarters importing tobacco from Virginia and Maryland, or sugar from the West Indies.<sup>52</sup> In this respect the councillors of the 1700s were quite different from their predecessors. Half a century earlier not one of the eleven councillors involved in overseas trade ranked among the most active merchants in the town, and they traded only with Ireland.<sup>53</sup>

Trade was thus important to a majority of the council of 1708–9 and it is hardly surprising that it voted to build a dock to remedy the lack of quayside space. The radical scheme promised benefits to many inhabitants in the town, for trade was a mainspring of its economy. There were 365 people engaged in overseas trade in 1708–9, perhaps one in four of the working population.<sup>54</sup> There were no

<sup>50</sup> Hull built its first enclosed dock in 1778, and London its first cargo-handling dock in 1802. The Bristol Merchant Venturers showed no urgency in dock building in the eighteenth century: Jackson, *Hull in the eighteenth century*, pp. 243–61; J. Bird, *The geography of the port of London* (London, 1957), pp. 45–9; P. McGrath, *The Merchant Venturers of the city of Bristol from its origins to the present day* (Bristol, 1975), *passim*. One estimate of the overall stimulus given to Liverpool by the dock puts total investment at £572,000 (£50,000 on the dock, £347,000 on shipping, £55,000 on industries, and £120,000 on housing in the new suburb): Hyde, *Liverpool and the Mersey*, pp. 14–15.

<sup>51</sup> Touzeau, *Rise and progress of Liverpool*, pp. 444–5.

<sup>52</sup> Consignments from port book: P.R.O., E 190/1375/08; councillors from Liverpool town book, Liv. R.O., 352 MIN/COU 1/6. For trade in the period see B. Poole, 'Liverpool trade in the reign of Queen Anne' (unpub. M.A. thesis, Liverpool Univ., 1961).

<sup>53</sup> Power, 'Councillors and commerce', pp. 314–15.

<sup>54</sup> The 365 traders were identified from the overseas port book: P.R.O.,



monopolies or restrictions on trade. Anyone was free to engage in it and agree terms with any of the 297 masters commanding the 145 ships involved.<sup>55</sup> Liverpool traders carried a range of commodities in overseas trade. Coal, salt, lead, iron, pottery, and other manufactures were staple exports; tobacco, sugar, linen, and soap the staple imports. Virginia and the West Indies were the major transatlantic destinations; Dublin, Belfast, Drogheda, and Sligo were the principal ports in Ireland, and the Isle of Man was also significant; Continental Europe was marginal, Archangel, Gothenberg, Rotterdam, and Lisbon the only, and rarely visited, destinations.<sup>56</sup>

Among the forty major merchants in the town were twelve councillors (Table 1).<sup>57</sup> The importance of their trade with Ireland (principally Dublin, fifty-three consignments, and Belfast, twenty-five) stands out. It was very important to three of the four most active traders, Thomas Johnson, John Cleivland, and William Squire, while only three, John Earle, Francis Goodrick, and Richard Norris, ignored it in favour of transatlantic or European trade. North American trade (dominated by Virginia with 114 shipments) was important and all engaged in it. West Indies trade was principally with Antigua, Barbados, and Jamaica (thirteen, fourteen, and fourteen shipments respectively). Transatlantic trade was overwhelmingly of imports. Some councillors specialized: Foster Cunliffe with the Isle of Man (twenty-nine consignments); Cleivland, Squire, and Norris with Archangel, the most visited European port (three, three, and two consignments respectively); Johnson with Belfast (twelve consignments); Squire with Dublin (eleven consignments); Cleivland, Cockshut, Gildart, Johnson, and Squire with Virginia (sixteen, ten, fourteen, seventeen, and ten consignments respectively).

E 190/1375/08. The number of dwelling places in the 1708 rate was 1,493; H. Peet, *Liverpool in the reign of Queen Anne* (Liverpool, 1908). The assumption that there was an economically active person in each dwelling suggests a proportion of one trader in four, but since some older householders would have been inactive the proportion might be closer to one trader in three.

<sup>55</sup> Provincial ports were moving away from monolithic trading companies which kept trade exclusive to their members. The Merchant Venturers' Company of Bristol, for example, allowed freedom to traders of all kinds in the late seventeenth century, but Bristol's progress continued to be institutionally constrained in a way that Liverpool's was not: Sacks, *Widening gate*, pp. 243-5, 257-65.

<sup>56</sup> P.R.O., E 190/1375/08.

<sup>57</sup> A major merchant is defined as one accounting for at least ten overseas consignments in the year.

TABLE 1 Merchant councillors in Liverpool, 1708-9, and their overseas trade

Name	Consignments (T = Total; E = Exports; I = Imports)																	
	Ireland			Isle of Man			N. America			W. Indies			Europe			Total		
	T	E	I	T	E	I	T	E	I	T	E	I	T	E	I			
Robert Barrow	9	3	6				1	0	1							10		
John Cleivland	18	10	8				24	2	22			12	0	12	3	1	2	
John Cockshut	15	4	11				13	1	12			3	1	2			31	
Thomas Coore	20	3	17	1	0	1	8	1	7			2	0	2	3	1	2	
Foster Cunliffe	7	2	5	29	11	18	16	0	16			2	0	2			54	
John Earle							17	6	11			1	0	1	5	1	4	
Richard Gildart	4	2	2	1	0	1	16	2	14			3	0	3			24	
Francis Goodrick							15	2	13			6	1	5			21	
Thomas Johnson	54	26	28	2	0	2	28	3	25			11	2	9	1	1	0	
Richard Norris							6	0	6			2	0	2	2	1	1	
William Squire	31	14	17				10	0	10			4	0	4	3	1	2	
George Tyrer	7	1	6				3	0	3			7	3	4			17	
Total	165	65	100	33	11	22	157	17	140			53	7	46	17	6	11	425

Sources: Port book 1708-9: P.R.O., E 190/1375/08; town book: Liv. R.O., 352 MIN/COU 1/6. Databases of both sources are deposited in 'The Liverpool community 1660-1750' at the Essex Data Archive. The year 1708-9 was chosen because councillors decided to build the dock then, and an overseas port book survives for the year. Though the year was a war year, transatlantic trade was not greatly affected, though European trade was: Poole, 'Liverpool's trade in the reign of Queen Anne', pp. 95-6.

The merchant councillors shared much in common besides their joint enterprise of the dock. Like merchants elsewhere, they jointly owned ships and shared intelligence about commodities, privateers, storms, and social connections.<sup>58</sup> They traded in similar commodities and engaged the same captains. Altogether eighty-three ships carried their wares during the customs year 1708–9. Some twenty of these ships were used by two merchant councillors, and eighteen by three or more. Seven ships were intensively used by councillors: the *Ann*, captained by James Everard, the *Cleivland*, captained by Bryan Blundell, the *Elizabeth*, under Edward Ratchdale or Thomas Campion, the *Hopewell*, variously captained, the *Neptune*, under Richard Thorpe, the *Tabitha and Priscilla*, under John Marsden, and the *William Galley*, under Adam MacMullen. All the councillors shared shipping space with fellow councillors: Cleivland, Coore, Cunliffe, Johnson, and Squire shared with all their fellows; Earle with all but one; Cockshut, Gildart, Goodrick, and Tyrer with all but two. Barrow was the only trader who shipped with a minority of his fellows, but his concentration on Irish trade might explain this. It is quite clear that councillors routinely worked closely together.<sup>59</sup>

We have no means of telling whether it was chance or planning which led to this joint shipping. There was only one formal business partnership, of William Squire and Peter Hall, specializing in trade with Ireland and Virginia. We can, however, make some deductions. Transatlantic voyages involved greater sharing. In the twenty-three ships which sailed in 1708–9 to Virginia, for example, an average of three merchant councillors shared space; in ships which shuttled to Dublin an average of only one and a half shared. John Cleivland serves as an example. He shipped commodities in six ships to Dublin in the year 1708–9, only two of which did he share with other councillors. In contrast, in seven of the ten ships used to trade with Virginia, he shared with his fellow councillors. He shared, for example, with Goodrick, Johnson, Earle, and Cockshut in the *Ann*, and with Goodrick, Earle, Johnson, Gildart, and Squire and Hall in the *Dolphin*. The group must have developed a strong common

<sup>58</sup> Two recent and able studies of merchant groups in ports are D. Hancock, *Citizens of the world: London merchants and the integration of the British Atlantic community, 1735–1785* (Cambridge, 1995), a study of twenty-three merchants linked by commercial and family ties; and J. Agnew, *Belfast merchant families in the seventeenth century* (Dublin, 1996), a study of thirty-two merchant families.

<sup>59</sup> P.R.O., E 190/1375/08.



interest in the safe return of their transatlantic cargoes, in their suppliers, in the price of commodities like tobacco, and in the practical problems of loading and unloading their wares in Liverpool.

Political differences did not prevent commercial co-operation. Whig and Tory councillors shipped together in twenty-five of the thirty-eight ships used by the group. Such 'cross-party' business co-operation was evident in other ventures too. Thomas Johnson, a Whig, and John Cleivland, a Tory, were joint investors in the Dungeon salt works on the Mersey. Johnson shared an interest with William Clayton, a Tory and fellow M.P. for the town, in investment in a ropemaking place.<sup>60</sup> Family ties certainly encouraged merchant councillors to ship together. Of the thirty-eight cases where ships carried goods for two or more merchant councillors, thirteen involved men who were related.<sup>61</sup> There were two important family groups. The Norris family (Councillor Richard being the youngest of eight children of Thomas Norris of Speke Hall near Liverpool) was one. John Cleivland was related to the Norrises by the marriage of his daughter to Edward Norris, Richard's older brother. William Squire was related to the family by marriage to Ann Norris, Richard's sister.<sup>62</sup> The Johnson family (Councillor Thomas being the son of a Liverpool merchant) was the second family at the centre of a network. Richard Gildart was related to the Johnsons by marriage to Anne Johnson, Thomas's daughter, and Peter Hall, William Squire's partner, was Thomas's brother-in-law.<sup>63</sup> Five of the twelve merchant councillors were therefore bound by family as well as business links. If we add to this the strong bond of friendship between Richard Norris and Thomas Johnson, evident from their correspondence, a powerful interest group in the council becomes very clear.

The unity of purpose and friendship of the merchant councillors is best revealed in the many letters surviving in the Norris papers. Many are directed to Richard Norris, the youngest of eight children, a councillor from 1695 until his death in 1729, and M.P. for the town in 1708-9.<sup>64</sup> What prompted correspondence were the frequent

<sup>60</sup> Poole, 'Liverpool's trade', pp. 6-8, 61.

<sup>61</sup> P.R.O., E 190/1375/08.

<sup>62</sup> See family tree in introduction to *Norris papers*; Liv. R.O., 920 NOR 2/579.

<sup>63</sup> I am grateful to Dr Ascott for this information: see Power, 'Councillors and commerce', p. 306; Poole, 'Liverpool's trade', p. 66.

<sup>64</sup> *Norris papers* contains selected letters; the original letters are in Liv. R.O., 920 NOR 1 and NOR 2, and are calendared on index cards.

visits to London of Norris, Johnson, or others of the group on business or to sit in parliament. Jasper Maudit was the first of a series of Liverpoolian merchants who represented the borough from January 1695. William Clayton succeeded him in August 1698 and served until 1708, and again in 1713. Thomas Johnson himself was M.P. from December 1701 until 1723. Richard Norris joined him in May 1708, to be replaced by John Cleivland in October 1710.<sup>65</sup>

Throughout the letters runs a concern about trade and events in Liverpool, and implicitly and explicitly there is much evidence of friendship. On 25 June 1703 Thomas Johnson wrote to Richard Norris, welcoming him back from London and hoping to have his company at home. He had spent two days with Richard's brother enjoying bowling, and he looked forward to the whole town being at Chester fair the next day.<sup>66</sup> Later in the year, on 22 October 1703, William Squire, married three days before to Ann Norris, reported to Richard Norris in London that Thomas Johnson and William Clayton, with several other members of the corporation, had dined at Speke Hall, the ancestral home of the Norris family.<sup>67</sup> Townsmen also socialized together in London. Ralph Peters, the new town clerk of Liverpool, wrote home to Richard Norris on 18 February 1707, describing a London meeting where Sir Roger Bradshaigh, Sir Alexander Rigby, and Alderman Johnson drank the health of Richard Norris, John Cockshut, William Squire, Peter Hall, and 'other Liverpool friends'.<sup>68</sup>

Thomas Johnson, the councillor who represented the town in parliament for over twenty years from 1701, was the most prolific correspondent. He missed Liverpool. On 17 March 1701 he wrote to Richard Norris, 'I should be a stranger to all proceedings at Liverpool if it were not for you.' He hoped that things went well in the town, that religious tensions between Anglican and dissenter were ameliorated by toleration, and that the next mayor would be 'on our side of the town' [i.e. a Whig]. He animatedly discussed the relocation of the corn market and opined that Castle Street was 'the properest place for it'; placing it in 'a beggarly part of the town'

<sup>65</sup> *House of Commons, 1660-90*, I, p. 288; History of Parliament unpublished paper, 'Liverpool Elections 1690-1715', copyright of which is acknowledged; J. Picton, *Memorials of Liverpool* (Liverpool, 1858), I, pp. 134-61; *The House of Commons, 1715-1754*, ed. R. Sedgwick (London, 1970), I, p. 270.

<sup>66</sup> *Norris papers*, p. 128.

<sup>67</sup> *Norris papers*, pp. 135-6.

<sup>68</sup> Liv. R.O., 920 NOR 2/424.

would be against the interest of the corporation. The letter is very characteristic of Johnson, more concerned with Liverpool and trade than in reporting the significant national events of the time, namely the commencement of Queen Anne's reign and the Dutch resolution to join an alliance against 'the great monarch' in France.<sup>69</sup> Just as on another occasion, when he wrote to Norris that he wanted a Liverpool rather than a London master for the *William Galley*, he demonstrated that Liverpool and its maritime community were of consuming importance to him.<sup>70</sup>

Trade matters dominated much of the correspondence. Often news was relayed of common hazards like the pressing of seamen or privateers. Johnson in Liverpool reported on 4 May 1694 to Norris in London that Timothy Smalshaw, a fellow merchant, had hands pressed at sea and was forced to put into Dublin.<sup>71</sup> Levinus Houston, a Liverpool merchant made town bailiff by the charter of 1695, wrote to Richard Norris on 8 September 1694 that John Lancaster had been captured by a French man-of-war, recaptured by Flushing privateers, and taken to Zealand. Several ships from Dublin and Belfast had been taken, and Pat Kyle, with a ship loaded with wine, had been taken in the Skerries, just two leagues from Beaumaris.<sup>72</sup> Thomas Johnson wrote to Richard Norris on 18 October 1702 that the *Ann and Mary* had been attacked by a privateer when returning from Antigua, the master shot, and most of the provisions taken.<sup>73</sup> On 2 July 1703 he wrote again to report the capture of the *Rebecca* with 450 slaves on board.<sup>74</sup> On 22 October 1703 he relayed news of the capture of the *Blessing* off Antigua, with nothing insured.<sup>75</sup> Anxiety about the fate of ships was a constant refrain. Thomas Johnson wrote to Richard Norris, staying with Alexander and Henry Cairnes in London, on 25 July 1704 about disquieting news of the Virginia fleet. Peter Hall, partner of William Squire, wrote to Norris on the same day confessing his spirits dampened by the news. He had an interest in the *Robert and Elizabeth* to the value of £500, not a penny of it insured.<sup>76</sup>

Many of Johnson's letters concern the fortunes of ships and trading ventures which he could follow only at arm's length from London. On 11 February 1703 he wrote to Norris, reporting that he

<sup>69</sup> *Norris papers*, pp. 79–82.

<sup>71</sup> Liv. R.O., 920 NOR 1/14.

<sup>73</sup> *Norris papers*, p. 97.

<sup>75</sup> Liv. R.O., 920 NOR 1/574.

<sup>70</sup> Liv. R.O., 920 NOR 2/342.

<sup>72</sup> Liv. R.O., 920 NOR 1/5.

<sup>74</sup> Liv. R.O., 920 NOR 2/302.

<sup>76</sup> Liv. R.O., 920 NOR 2/374.



had been to the Admiralty and procured protection from impressment for 'something above our complement' of men. He advised Norris to man and get the *Mersey* clear of the port while the immunity held. By 28 May that year the ship was at Faro in Portugal. James Holden wrote from there to tell Thomas Johnson, Richard Norris, and John Cleivland that the vessel was safe despite being chased by a Spanish ship, but he could bring back nothing but brooms, canes, cork, and pipes of oil, since fruits and oils were embargoed by the king of Spain. By 19 September the *Mersey* was in Hoylake, on 22 October despatched to Milford Haven in south Wales to load corn, and in early November sent up river to Middlewich for salt.<sup>77</sup>

Their trading interdependence certainly united councillors. Thomas Johnson left decisions about what commodities the *Mersey* was to carry to Faro to Norris and Cleivland.<sup>78</sup> Peter Hall and William Squire dealt with the sale of Jamaican sugar and currants for Richard Norris in London. Hall took samples of Norris's goods to Chester fair at the end of September 1703 to sell to Mr Bennion. On 8 October he was still attempting to sell the sugar to Silvester Moorcroft, and on 15 October William Squire was hoping to ship it to a sugar refinery in Dublin.<sup>79</sup> On 3 December 1703 he wrote to Norris reporting on the difficulty of procuring calf skins for him and the continuing difficulty in disposing of the sugar. With the late arrival of Virginia ships, the wet condition of their tobacco, and consequent low prices, he complained that trade was poor.<sup>80</sup> Liverpool councillors also bought ships together. Johnson wrote to Richard Norris on 11 August 1704 about a well-fitted Wexford ship offered for under £500, though he had second thoughts a week later. His partner, William Squire, was for the 'best runner'. A ship put up for sale by William Clayton and partners, costing £800, was considered by Thomas Johnson, John Cockshut, and John Cleivland.<sup>81</sup> Finally, Johnson, Thomas Sweeting, Richard Gildart, and Richard Norris purchased the *Laurel* on 30 November 1705 for £805.<sup>82</sup>

<sup>77</sup> Liv. R.O., 920 NOR 1/220, 532, 302, 574, 289.

<sup>78</sup> Liv. R.O., 920 NOR 1/195.

<sup>79</sup> Liv. R.O., 920 NOR 2/268, 261; NOR 1/244.

<sup>80</sup> Liv. R.O., 920 NOR 2/376, 283.

<sup>81</sup> Liv. R.O., 920 NOR 2/349, 379, 350.

<sup>82</sup> Liv. R.O., 920 NOR 2/391, 596, 597.

One local enemy which united Liverpool merchants was the customs men. This was particularly evident in 1702 when a crackdown on allowances against duty for damaged tobacco imports was imposed. Captain Harris, a customs officer, had complained to the commissioners in London that too much tobacco was passed as damaged at Liverpool and requested that additional officers be sent 'to curb the ill practices of this wicked port'.<sup>83</sup> The commissioners ordered Mr Nash, another local officer, to view imported tobacco and sent Mr Manly and Mr Walker to inspect what was going on.<sup>84</sup> Peter Hall, William Clayton, Thomas Johnson, John Cleivland, and eight other merchants turned up at the inspection, and engaged in 'a very sharp dispute about the nature of tobacco, especially such as deserved damage', whereupon the London men said they 'found everything right and our tobacco bad' and therefore to be excused duty.<sup>85</sup> The crisis seemed to be contained, and Manly and Walker were declared 'rational men' who found the Liverpool tobacco merchants 'an honest, industrious people who deserve encouragement'.<sup>86</sup>

Customs duty was paid in full on unopened and re-exported hogsheads of tobacco which were assumed to be undamaged. Thomas Johnson thought that such trade would end customs allowances altogether, reduce the sale price of tobacco, and put out of business 'half our ships in Liverpool'.<sup>87</sup> Other merchants, Mr Houghton and Mr Pemberton, for example, did not object. Johnson's fellow M.P., William Clayton, maintained to Mr Manly that many Liverpool tobacco merchants shared their opinion.<sup>88</sup> The point was ill judged. Despite his apparent 'rational' assessment of the honesty of Liverpool merchants the previous October, Manly was convinced that extraordinary damages were allowed on tobacco at the port, and was reporting as much to the customs commissioners.<sup>89</sup> By 7 January 1703 the town was 'in a flame' about the restrictions which the commissioners might impose.<sup>90</sup> Even William Clayton became concerned at possible damage to the tobacco trade,

<sup>83</sup> T. Johnson to R. Norris, 9 Oct. 1702: *Norris papers*, p. 95.

<sup>84</sup> P. Hall to R. Norris, 6 Oct. 1702: Liv. R.O., 920 NOR 1/183.

<sup>85</sup> P. Hall to R. Norris, 20 Oct. 1702: *Norris papers*, pp. 99-100.

<sup>86</sup> P. Hall to R. Norris, 27 Oct. 1702: Liv. R.O., 920 NOR 1/189.

<sup>87</sup> 17 Mar. 1701: *Norris papers*, pp. 79-82.

<sup>88</sup> T. Johnson to R. Norris, 22 Dec. 1702: *Norris papers*, pp. 110-11.

<sup>89</sup> T. Johnson to R. Norris, 31 Dec. 1702: *Norris papers*, pp. 114-15.

<sup>90</sup> T. Johnson to R. Norris, 7 Jan. 1703: Liv. R.O., 920 NOR 1/209.

and requested that Captain Harris and Mr Nash be removed as local customs men.<sup>91</sup> Unsurprisingly the tobacco entrepreneurs made common cause in putting profit above honest dealings with the customs service.

Most revealing of all is the occasional indication of intimacy revealed in letters. Thomas Johnson refers to William Squire and Richard Norris as brothers, as though they were blood relatives.<sup>92</sup> There are expressions of neighbourly concern among councillors: Peter Hall fears he will not see Mrs Houston, widow of Levinus Houston, bailiff of the new council in 1695, alive again, and refers to Alderman Thomas Sweeting, instrumental in negotiating with the rector of Walton in 1698 to prepare the way for the creation of the parish of Liverpool,<sup>93</sup> as a 'poor surviving alderman' after his wife's death; William Squire describes his sympathy for Alderman Houghton, who was suffering from gout, though they had disagreed on the way that customs should be levied on tobacco.<sup>94</sup>

Patchy and episodic though this evidence is, it is suggestive of shared risks, ships, commodities, and experiences. It would be too much to claim that all merchant councillors got on well together but it is clear that they were well aware of their common interest and were careful to co-operate. Their political, religious, and personal differences were less significant than the challenges which they shared. Moreover, the prize that beckoned, a trade which promised wealth unimagined by a previous generation, was a compelling lure. Like a family, the Liverpool community was aware of its identity and common interest in a competitive world.

#### IV

The range and intensity of corporation activity in Liverpool during the period is striking. Underlying the various initiatives was a political consensus based on the control of affairs by a small oligarchy of merchants which superseded the landowning families influential in the town in the seventeenth century. Confident in their new-found position and buoyed up by the considerable growth in

<sup>91</sup> T. Johnson to R. Norris, 4 Feb. 1703: *Norris papers*, pp. 126-7.

<sup>92</sup> Liv. R.O., 920 NOR 2/376, 379.

<sup>93</sup> Touzeau, *Rise and progress of Liverpool*, p. 342.

<sup>94</sup> Liv. R.O., 920 NOR 2/261, 374, 376.



their trading activities, the councillors embarked on the pioneering project of building a dock, the financial and engineering risks of the project hardening their determination to make it a success. The merchant councillors after 1695 formed a close community. Bound together by trade, by family ties, friendship, and commitment to momentous change, they drove the town and port forward. To credit a charter for creating the virtuous circle of trade and port growth is, of course, a simplification. Trade had been growing before 1695 and demanded port development. Yet the charter did come at an opportune time, placing in power men with the ambition to encourage trade by providing a dock. The breakthrough and the rapidity of Liverpool's growth in the early eighteenth century owed much to the energy and cohesion of the group propelled into power in 1695.

