CORRESPONDENCE: NORTH-WEST MANCHESTER ELECTION
Sharp, Evelyn
The Manchester Guardian (1901-1959); Nov 25, 1910;
ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The Guardian and The Observer
pg. 4

CORRESPONDENCE

NORTH-WEST MANCHESTER ELECTION.

To the Editor of the Manchester Guardian.

Sir,—Many Liberal workers of both sexes who are engaged in suburban constituencies in the evening may be able to give an hour or two during the daytime to canvassing in the central city wards. If so, their help would be greatly appreciated, and I should be glad if they would call and offer their services at our central committee-rooms, 30, Spring Gardens. Liberals in North-west Manchester would greatly facilitate our work if they would send in their promises to vote to the committee-room, and save our canvassers the trouble of calling upon them.—Yours, &c.,

ALEXANDER PORTER, Hon. Sec. for the Candidature of Colonel Sir George Kemp.

Chief Committee-rooms, Tower Chambers, 30, Spring Gardens, Manchester, November 24.

MR. ASQUITH AND WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

To the Editor of the Manchester Guardian.

Sir,—The drawback to interpretations of Mr. Asquith's pledges is this—that his friends interpret them in *our* favour until he has failed to redeem them, and then proceed to interpret them according to *his own* glosses, and say that he has redeemed them. Thus, when he pledged himself to bring in a Reform Bill before the end of last Parliament, Liberals were astounded that we were not grateful. Yet when he dissolved without the Reform Bill Liberals said, "How could he be expected to bring one in?" They quite overlooked the fact that that was what we had said when he made that unconsidered promise! Again, when Mr. Asquith gave a pledge that the House should be allowed "effectively to deal" with our question, you, sir, said that this must mean to allow full facilities for all stages of the bill. Yet, when these were denied and the same lawyer-like phrase "effectively deal" is offered us for the "dim and speculative future," you suggest that this should on the eve of a general election pacify us. I am glad you interpret the pledge for a bill as meaning the Conciliation Bill, and I am glad that the Conciliation Committee should also interpret it so, but I should be still gladder if Mr. Asquith would himself say plainly what he means, and not leave his replies, like a corrupt text, to the varying and contradictory ingenuity of commentators and apologists.

Last January we women had the weary task of putting our demand before the electors and candidates, and we did it unaided by party press or politicians. This December the same weary task is laid upon us, but with this difference—the "Times" has declared that by Mr. Asquith's statement in the House there are now two issues before the country, and that one of these is women's suffrage. Is it too much to hope that, since the anti-Liberal and anti-suffrage papers are taking up our cause as a live issue in this election, the Liberal and suffrage papers will do the same?

I should like to be allowed to say that my letter in your yesterday's issue was written before the final negotiations with Mr. Russell had been concluded, and that his frank pledge to press for facilities early next session makes his candidature acceptable to members of the National Union.—Yours, &c.,

November 24. H. M. SWANWICK.

To the Editor of the Manchester Guardian.

Sir,—I quite agree with Mrs. Swanwick's letter published in to-day's "Guardian." I consider that Mr. Asquith's words are most evasive. They may mean that this question may be postponed for six or seven years, and he may still say he has not broken his pledge. The conduct of the Cabinet, and especially of those Ministers who profess to be in favour of the suffrage being granted, is to my mind inexplicable.

Besides this, it is an error in tactics. Had Mr. Asquith merely said, "Next session if possible," he would have had the help in the coming election of every Liberal suffragist, and would have brought about a truce even with the extremists. As it is the impression left upon our minds is that he does not himself intend so long as he is in office to move in the matter.—Yours, &c., J. E. L.

November 24.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION.

To the Editor of the Manchester Guardian.

Sir,—Although a member of the party entirely opposed to most of the views expressed in your paper, which by the way I read and enjoy daily, I am bound to confess that there is much point in the Liberal argument that our present Constitution favours the Conservatives, and does not give the Liberals justice. But it seems to my simple business mind that, given moderation on both sides, there is such an easy way to remedy this difficulty without putting our ancient Constitution into the melting-pot. The House of Lords has declared over and over again that it has no desire in these latter days to oppose the will of the people, when that will has been clearly expressed. On the other hand, the Liberals have declared over and over again that they have no desire to force legislation upon the people which is distasteful to them. I accept both those declarations. They form a common platform of agreement upon which it is surely possible to erect machinery by which the wishes of the people, and those wishes only, can be carried out. Whether we always know what is good for us or not is another matter; we all recognise that in this year of 1910 and onwards we must have what we want, good for us or bad; we can tolerate no veto on our collective desires as expressed by the majority of our votes.

I would suggest therefore that the composition of the House of Lords be amended upon the lines suggested by the peers themselves, but that their powers be restricted so that in the event of their refusing to pass a bill sent up by a Liberal Government their power of refusal shall be limited to demanding a referendum if the Government wishes it. If, when this is obtained, it is favourable to the Liberal bill the Lords must pass it without question.

But we must go a great deal further than that. There is considerable point in the Liberal argument—that when a Conservative Government is in their bills are passed by the Lords practically as a matter of course, no matter how distasteful they may be to the then Liberal minority, and, as that minority honestly believes, distasteful to the majority of the people. The argument is sound that the Liberals have a grievance, and no one rests permanently under a grievance, hence the present drastic proposals. But here, again, the remedy is simple. Let the Opposition also have the power of demanding a referendum upon any bill which the Lords have passed upon being sent up by a Conservative Government in the Commons. To my mind the whole matter seems so simple and needs nothing of a revolutionary character to put it right. Once agreed upon the principle that neither party wishes to pass bills which the people do not desire or to withhold from them bills which they do, it only remains necessary to establish the machinery by which the people's wishes can be ascertained—namely, a workable scheme of referendum, the use of which can be demanded by both Government and Opposition. Surely something of this kind is preferable to a long-drawn-out constitutional struggle which, at the finish, would not put a single sixpence in anybody's pocket.—Yours, &c., F. S. WILLOUGHBY.

Constitutional Club, Manchester, Nov. 24.

MR. BALFOUR AND "THE TRADE."

To the Editor of the Manchester Guardian.

Sir,—May I call the attention of your readers to a sentence in Mr. Balfour's speech at Nottingham which may have a very important influence on the forthcoming elections? On the 15th of November a speech was made at a "trade" dinner at Bristol by Mr. F. P. Whitbread, a director of the well-known Whitbread's Brewery and also a vice president of the Brewers' Society. Referring to the approaching crisis, Mr. Whitbread significantly remarked that "he did not think that the licensed trade would give the Unionist party their enthusiastic support at the general election unless they had some definite pledge before they went to the poll that they would see that some of the intolerable burdens resting upon their shoulders were removed."

This was on Tuesday. On Thursday, November 17, Mr. Whitbread and the brewers received from Mr. Balfour at Nottingham the answer to their hint. "I will only say," said he, "that, in my opinion, it is absolutely necessary"—in order, it is presumed, to secure the use of the brewers' public-houses for electioneering purposes—"that we should do what we can to remedy the gross injustice which has been done to the licence-holders"—for which term we may read "brewers." The bribe having been suggested by the one side, then offered by the other, is forthwith formally accepted by "the trade," and on Tuesday the 22nd November a manifesto was issued by the Licensed Victuallers' National Defence League of England and Wales, which contains the following sentences:—"We can now regard as quite equal to a promise the statement made by the leader of the Unionist party (Mr. Balfour) at Nottingham on the 17th inst." (then follows the passage quoted above). "In view of Mr. Balfour's performances in the past the licence-holder can have the utmost faith in the declaration he (Mr. Balfour) has publicly made that there is a 'gross injustice' which must be remedied." Then follows a stirring order to the licence-holders "not only to vote but to work hard for every candidate" who will help "the trade."

How a similar order was obeyed at the election in January we all know. The leader-writer in "The Trade Paper," the very ably edited organ of "the trade" in Manchester and the North, has stated that

> as a matter of fact, the trade worked well. In some districts—Manchester, I am told, is one of them—the forces of "the trade" maintained the fight almost alone against the onset of uncompromising Free Trade. . . . It is no mere coincidence that it was in the rural districts of England—where the link between the landlord of the village inn and the village labourers who assemble within its cheerful shelter is stronger than in the cities,—and in the rural districts only that the victory of the Unionist party was anything like complete."

He also states that "it is not too much to say that in some constituencies the result of the arrangements made by the Licensed Victuallers' Association was practically to double the influence and power of the Conservative organisation, and must have had no little effect upon the poll."

The general election now at hand raises an issue of enormous importance to the future of this country. No one can object to the most ample discussion of that issue; but I think that every thoughtful citizen, whatever his political views may be, will resent the intrusion into this fight of a trade which enters the political arena with the sole object of financial self-aggrandisement utterly regardless of the national well-being. For those electors who have not yet made up their minds as to the vote they shall give it must surely be a matter for grave consideration as to whether they can wisely trust the future destinies of this country in the hands of men who are relying for success in this contest upon the demoralising co-operation of the liquor traffic.—Yours, &c.,

GEORGE B. WILSON, Secretary United Kingdom Alliance.

16, Deansgate, Manchester, November 24.

THE CAMPAIGN OF ABUSE AGAINST MANCHESTER.

To the Editor of the Manchester Guardian.

Sir,—I am sorry that your correspondent "Agent" has not placed his name and address to his letter in your to-day's issue, because it is most unpleasant to reply to a man who hides his identity behind a *nom de plume*. Moreover, from his letter I cannot tell whether he is trying to perpetrate a huge joke on the public or is serious in his statements.

Replying to his criticism of my letter, I maintain that (1) Manchester shipping-houses do not import foreign-made goods into England for re-exportation, and if such a thing were done in an exceptional case it would not amount to anything worth mentioning. Your correspondent seems to forget that the cost of packing and carriage from the foreign mill to the foreign port, and from the foreign port to the English port, and from the English port to Manchester, for re-packing and re-exporting would amount to a prohibitive tax, which in 99 cases out of 100 would make such a transaction impossible. It, however, may be that some class of goods may be purchased by Manchester shippers on the Continent for direct exportation from the foreign port over sea, but in that case the profit falls to Manchester, and the English revenue will eventually benefit by the transaction in the shape of income tax.

(2) Your correspondent's argument re paragraph 2 is dealt with in the latter sentence of number one.

(3) I have taken some trouble in finding out the number of Continental houses established in Manchester, and also the number of foreign agents representing such firms, and I maintain that my estimate given in my previous letter is absolutely correct. On the concluding paragraph of your correspondent it will be superfluous to enter, as the foreign agent occupying a room at £20 a year, or about 8s. per week, does not speak well for the size of the business. But even in occupying an office at 8s. per week he would pay local taxes in proportion to the rent.—Yours, &c., GEORGE HAHLO.

100, Portland-street, Manchester, November 24.

"A CLEAR ISSUE?"

To the Editor of the Manchester Guardian.

Sir,—Mrs. Swanwick, in her letter which appears in your columns to-day and replying to your leader comments yesterday, states that "it is well known that the majority [of the Cabinet] is favourable to us." The words in brackets are mine. Can Mrs. Swanwick assert with truth that the present Cabinet or Government have a mandate from the electors, whose voice the present Government are so anxious should prevail, to pass either the conciliation or other similar bill granting the franchise to women? The Government are appealing to the country on the sole issue of the Lords' veto. Are we to understand that if they are returned to power they have a mandate to make such a stupendous change as will fundamentally alter the basis of the electorate, or a mandate to grant Home Rule to Ireland? Nothing but a specific Referendum in each case will represent the views of the electorate on such grave issues.

May I briefly refer to your editorial comment on Mr. Horsfall's letter, which, I believe, upholds the Referendum as the only authority for Parliament to do the nation's business? I think you will agree that "by their choice of agents principals do not give an implied direction" to undertake any duties but what are assigned to them, and certainly not anything antagonistic to the majority of the principals.—Yours, &c.,

November 24. J. W. G. BEAUMONT.

"THE COMING ELECTION—AND AFTER."

To the Editor of the Manchester Guardian.

Sir,—I addressed a letter to you the other day on this question asking what guarantees Mr. Asquith had obtained that if he gets a majority equal to his present one the will of the people of the British Isles will be carried out "once and for all." I wrote in the spirit of Thomas the Sceptic; but having stood near to Mr. Asquith as he delivered the whole of his magnificent oration at the National Liberal Club last week I came away prepared to "trust Asquith." Once again, we fight to win a decisive victory; but I venture in all deference to appeal to our great Prime Minister to give logical and enthusiastic assurances in his speeches that this fight is a fight to a finish. It is time we settled the matter.—Yours, &c.,

WALTER WYNN.

26, Bellingdon Road, Chesham, Bucks., November 23.

CORN LAW PRICES

To the Editor of the Manchester Guardian.

Sir,—Mr. A. Taylor, at his meeting last night, asserted that—

> when the Corn Laws were abolished they were told that the price of wheat would naturally go down. But as a matter of fact it increased from 50s. 1d. per quarter, when the Corn Laws were in force in 1843, to 69s. 9d. in the succeeding years after they had been abolished. There was no substantial reduction until about thirty years later, when, owing to improved methods of transit and supplies coming in from other districts, the price of wheat began steadily to decline.

How untrue this statement is is shown by the "Gazette" average prices for the years 1846 to 1850, which are as follows:—54s. 8d., 69s. 9d., 50s. 6d., 44s. 3d., 40s. 3d. per quarter of wheat. The top price given by Mr. Taylor is for one year only, which followed the bad year 1846.

The working man does not follow the price of wheat in quarters but in 4lb. loaves. In 1847 the price of a common 4lb. loaf at the bread-shops in Oldfield Lane, Salford, was 10½d., and a similar loaf in 1850 was 4½d. Surely from 10½d. to 4½d. is a substantial reduction, and it did not take thirty years but three to bring it about. When will Tariff Reformers test their figures before they proclaim them?—Yours, &c., JOHN EDWARDS.

Mayfield, Cheadle Hulme, November 23.

SIR GEORGE KEMP'S CAMPAIGN

To the Editor of the Manchester Guardian.

Sir,—At Sir George Kemp's first public meeting he was asked this question:—

"If a tax put on our goods by the colonies is to our detriment, why should not a tax imposed by us be to the detriment of the foreigner?"

You say the following answer was much cheered:—

"If we put on a tax no doubt it would be to the detriment of the foreigner. But we don't carry on trade to damage other people; we carry it on to make profit."

Will Sir George Kemp kindly tell us or will someone ask him at a meeting: "What do artisans do when they have no trade to carry on?" We are all, in fact, robbing somebody else of employment, and the main point is that the foreigner is enabled by his tariff wall to be the best man at the job, and we want to curtail his depredations.

When you do this there will be more cheers.—Yours, &c., A WORKING MAN.

[(1) A tariff injures both parties to the exchange of commodities which it obstructs or prevents, but it injures most that party which cannot evade it by an alternative exchange. (2) It is not true that every worker is robbing another of employment. Every contribution to the production of wealth is a benefit to the whole community. (3) We rejoice that in spite of his exposure of the "depredations" of foreign workers "A Working Man" is able to use an excellent typewriter for his correspondence.—ED. "GUARD."]

"ASSAULTS" ON CABINET MINISTERS.

To the Editor of the Manchester Guardian.

Sir,—I was one of the members of the Women's Social and Political Union who spoke to Mr. Asquith when he was on his way from the House of Commons to Downing-street on Tuesday afternoon. He was standing on the edge of the pavement, apparently waiting for a taxi-cab; a small crowd of people had gathered, among whom were a few of the members of the suffrage deputation; against these the Prime Minister was protected by one or two constables and, I am told, some officers in plain clothes.

As the difficulty of obtaining an audience of the Prime Minister is almost insuperable when one is a woman, I and another suffragist at once approached as near as his bodyguard would permit and put a series of political points before him: "Why will you not give us our bill, Mr. Asquith? You have placed a veto upon the House of Commons. Are these Liberal principles?" and so on. Mr. Asquith made no reply. When he finally escaped in a motor-car one of the women, exasperated, broke the little window at the back of the car with her hand. I do not know to what incident you refer in your leading article when you speak of a "gross personal attack"; it did not occur within my own observation, nor can I gather particulars of one. It is at least a significant fact that where 153 arrests were made not one of the women arrested was charged with assaulting a Minister, though, even had this been the case, I think something could be said in defence of women who are subjected to assault from the police, acting under orders from the Home Office, every time they try to approach the Prime Minister in peaceable deputation.

You make use also in your leading article of the word "unmannerly" in connection with a similar incident on Tuesday afternoon. If we who put those unanswered questions were indeed unmannerly, then it seems to me a little thing to be, in comparison with the great thing at stake. Women have subconsciously readjusted their sense of the values of things in the last five years. Denied the right, freely exercised by men, of putting questions at a political meeting, denied the power of petition which we had thought was ours by the Bill of Rights, denied the passage into law, while there was time, opportunity, and a favourable majority in the House, of the measures that would have given us our just liberties, we cannot any longer be expected to remember our manners and forget our wrongs when a Prime Minister, guarded by police, walks past us in the street. Had this been a men's instead of a women's agitation, I think Ministers would have had more to fear by this time from the agitators than awkward questions at awkward moments, and lack of manners would not have been held to count for much where human rights and wrongs were in question.—Yours, &c.,

EVELYN SHARP.

15, Mount Carmel Chambers, Duke's Lane, Kensington, London, November 23.

[In regard to Mr. Asquith, the Press Association report—the only one available—stated that he was "badly mobbed" and struck and that the window of his motor-car was smashed by one of the women. "A gross personal attack" seems to us not an exaggerated description of such a proceeding. As to Mr. Birrell, there can be no question, we imagine, of the violence of the attack upon him. What is certain is that as the result of it he is confined to his bed and has had to give up for the present all his public engagements. We fully admit that the word "unmannerly" is inappropriate in this connection; it is very much too mild. We are unable to understand the frame of mind which would seek to justify an attack of this kind on one of the kindest of men and best friends of the suffrage cause, and it is lamentable that, so far as we have observed, there has been no sort of expression of regret.—ED. "GUARD."].

WOMEN LIBERALS.

To the Editor of the Manchester Guardian.

Sir,—At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Lancashire and Cheshire Union of Women's Liberal Associations, held to-day, the following resolution was passed unanimously:—

"That this Committee desire to express to the Prime Minister their sense of appreciation and gratification at his statement yesterday in the House of Commons with regard to women's suffrage should his Government be again returned to power, and believe that the effect of his statement will be to stimulate still further the efforts of Liberal women in Lancashire and Cheshire on behalf of the Liberal candidates.—Yours, &c.,

NESSIE STEWART-BROWN, President.
MARGARET BARTON, Chairman.

Manchester, November 23.

PRE-REFORMATION ENDOWMENTS.—W. A. W. writes from Seedley:—May I enter a *caveat* against one detail of Artifex's interesting article in your issue of to-day? He says that it is "the fact" that "pre-Reformation endowments were given for the service of the whole nation." In the case of parochial endowments it is surely clear enough that they were given for the use of this or that particular church or parson of the *Ecclesia Anglicana*, the purpose to which they are still applied.

HOME-MADE FOGS.—Miss Mary Higgs writes from Oldham:—I am glad to see in your issues of Wednesday and Thursday that there is at last something like a public protest against the Manchester smoke nuisance. I write to point out that the question is not of importance to Manchester only. Round Manchester is a ring of towns the climate of which is seriously affected by Manchester smoke. In Oldham there is sufficient public interest and steady prosecution of offenders to abate the evil somewhat. This is shown by the fact that while spindles have increased by common consent the smoke is not so bad as it was. But there, only seven miles away, is Manchester, "the smoke of whose torment goes up for ever and ever." She stands between us and the clean, health-giving sea breezes; she makes us a present of her soot and fog. If it is fine on a cold frosty day in Manchester we have the fog. Surely such a great city, the city of merchant princes, should set an example of self-purification!

THE SCHOOLS OF THE FUTURE.—Mr. Charles Peach writes from 5, Cross-street, Manchester: It may be pointed out to the Rev. D. P. Buckle that it was not the Public Control party that announced "it could afford to wait"—we have no intention of "waiting,"—but, as a matter of fact, it was a great Churchman, Mr. D. C. Lathbury. In the "Times" of October 10 he said: "The opponents of the Act of 1902 need be in no hurry to amend it. It gives, no doubt, what they hold to be undue favour to Church schools. But in spite of this favour they are dying year by year." The Bishop of St. Asaph, Professor Inge (in the "Nineteenth Century"), and now the "Church Times" all say the same. While I very much doubt the complete conversion of Councillor Thewlis, I do not doubt that his sense of humour will appreciate the "overwhelming significance" of that event, if it has happened, to the fortunes of the great Anglican Church and her fast-disappearing monopoly in public elementary education.—"Liberator" writes:—Mr. Buckle and other opponents of popular control are entitled to make the most of Councillor Thewlis's "complete conversion" to their views. What we are more concerned about, however, is whether Councillor Thewlis's right-about-face represents the official attitude of Manchester Liberalism. In Ardwick Liberalism has secured the support of Canon Nunn, and Nonconformists have too much reason to fear what may have been the price of that support. In South Salford Nonconformists are expected to work hard for a candidate who dismisses the Nonconformist protest as a mere ebullition of temper and who gives no sign that he is prepared to give any relief to our hard-pressed rural comrades. Without trying to impose the Free Church Council shibboleth on all Progressive candidates Nonconformists are entitled to ask whether in voting Liberal they will be voting for the perpetuation of their present disabilities or for their modification or redress.

PLAY CENTRES FOR CHILDREN.—Mr. Mark Winder writes from 29, Portland-street, Manchester:—Mrs. Humphry Ward's letter with regard to play centres in London has called forth several letters from institutions in Manchester which are doing similar work. May I be permitted to describe something of what is being done on these lines at the Collyhurst Recreation Rooms? The ideal which the committee has before them is to provide innocent amusement and education for persons of all ages and both sexes. Arrangements are made for tiny children, from the age of three upwards, who come to the "Children's Club," and are taught kindergarten games and songs in the winter time, while in the summer those under school age revel in the sand garden, which is open five days a week under able and careful supervision. From the Children's Club they pass to the Junior Boys' and Girls' Club, managed on similar lines to the children's happy evenings, and from there to the Girls' Club or Lads' Club, where they may stay until they are married, afterwards joining the Young Married Women's Class, the Mothers' Meeting, and the Workers' Union, which entitles them to admission to the social evenings and "at homes" held on Saturday evenings. Work of this kind, however, cannot be carried on without constant reinforcements of both workers and money, and all offers of help will be gratefully received by the Secretary, Mrs. Ledsham, Collyhurst Recreation Rooms, Willert-street, Rochdale Road.

MR. LLOYD GEORGE AND WOMEN SUFFRAGE INTERRUPTERS.—Mr. A. Brunel writes from Frankville, Portslade:—I am sure all fair-minded men and women will be grateful to you for publishing Mr. Edgar Pooley's letter, in which he draws attention to Mr. Lloyd George's oft-repeated and offensive remarks to men suffrage interrupters. To accuse these men of being hirelings is a disgusting and unfair charge, which well merits the cries of "Shame" that your correspondent says greeted it at the Paragon Theatre, though according to the "Times" it was greeted with cheers.

MR. ARTEMUS JONES AND THE OSBORNE CASE.—Mr. Artemus Jones has addressed to a Wrexham correspondent who inquired whether it was true, as rumoured, that he expressed himself to the Denbigh Boroughs' Selection Committee as opposed to legislation dealing with the Osborne judgment, a letter, in the course of which he says:—"The rumour you mention is quite unfounded. It is true that the Osborne judgment raised the only subject on which there was any difference of view between myself and the Selection Committee. But the difference was not a difference of opinion; it was merely a difference as to the best method of solving the difficulties raised by the case. My contention was, and is, that the true remedy is an Act amending the definition of trade unions so as to bring such a compulsory levy within their powers, with a conscience clause enabling trade unionists who object to withhold that tiny proportion of their subscription which goes to such an object."

THE SUFFRAGE DISTURBANCES.—Miss A. G. Robinson writes from Northenden:—The severe rebuke which you administered on Wednesday to the militant members of the suffragist party was indeed well deserved. As one among many women who have read with an increasing sense of shame the reports of the present "militant campaign" (which surely reached its height in Tuesday's contemptible achievements) may I add my small contribution to the swelling voice of protest? Was the performance of Tuesday given to us as a sample of the "humanising influence" to be exercised by the women who employ such doubtful means to attain their goal? Foul means never yet led the way to fair ends. Rights that need to be upheld by the reprehensible methods now in favour among the militant suffragists would hardly seem to be a desirable end for womankind to attain. Many women, understanding true values, realise that a personal vote may be dearly bought by the probable loss of many privileges hitherto enjoyed, and of the great, though quiet, influence exercised upon the voting power of the nation by its women up to the present time. The present is surely one of the times when it becomes the duty of the hitherto silent body of women to overcome their natural distaste for publicity and to meet the needs of the day by recording in a deci- [illegible] their strong disapproval of the present [illegible] ings.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

H. N.—It was in the autumn of last year.

J. A. IVESON.—You give insufficient data.

B. BOADLEY.—Allen, Gould, and Larkin were executed for the murder of Police Sergeant Brett.

C. DANN.—Apply to the Liberal Publication Department for pamphlets on the subjects you mention.