

On the failure of the Contagious Diseases Acts : as proved by the official evidence submitted to the Select Committee of the House of Commons, 1879, 1880 and 1881 / James Stansfeld.

Contributors

Stansfeld, James, 1820-1898.
Royal College of Surgeons of England

Publication/Creation

London : To be had of the Secretary of the National Association for the Repeal of the Contagious Diseases Acts, [1881]

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/f9uxuts9>

Provider

Royal College of Surgeons

License and attribution

This material has been provided by This material has been provided by The Royal College of Surgeons of England. The original may be consulted at The Royal College of Surgeons of England. where the originals may be consulted. This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E library@wellcomecollection.org
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

THE RT. HON. JAMES STANSFELD, M.P.,

ON THE

FAILURE 3.

OF THE

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS,

AS PROVED BY THE

OFFICIAL EVIDENCE

SUBMITTED TO THE

SELECT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF

COMMONS,

1879, 1880 AND 1881.

“The neck of this Iniquity is broken I say it is impossible, if they will give their attention to such a statement as I have addressed to you to-day, that the Government can do other than one thing—and that is Repeal the Acts.” —(Vide Speech.)

TO BE HAD OF THE
SECRETARY OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE
REPEAL OF THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS,
2, WESTMINSTER CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

Price Twopence, Post-free.

THE NEW YORK BOTANICAL GARDEN
CONTAINING A LIST OF THE
PLANTS
CONTAINING DISEASES
OF THE
GARDEN

LONDON :

PRINTED BY PEWTRESS & CO.,

15, GREAT QUEEN STREET, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, W.C.

CONFERENCE OF REPEAL ASSOCIATIONS IN LONDON.

MR. STANSFELD, M.P. ON THE HYGIENIC FAILURE OF THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

AN important Conference of Delegates from Repeal Associations and other well-known friends of the cause was convened by Mr. Stansfeld, M.P., on Tuesday, October 25th, 1881, at Neumeyer Hall, London. Mr. Stansfeld himself occupied the chair.

The Secretary of the National Association read the following list of the Associations there represented :—

The NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, The CITY OF LONDON COMMITTEE, The FRIENDS' ASSOCIATION, The WESLEYAN ASSOCIATION, The CONGREGATIONAL COMMITTEE, The LADIES' NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, The NATIONAL MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, The NORTHERN COUNTIES' LEAGUE, The MIDLAND COUNTIES' ELECTORAL UNION, The BIRMINGHAM LADIES' COMMITTEE, The WORKING MEN'S NATIONAL LEAGUE, The BRITISH AND CONTINENTAL FEDERATION, The NORTH-EASTERN ASSOCIATION, The SCOTTISH NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, The GENTLEMEN'S AND WORKING MEN'S COMMITTEE (Chatham), The GENTLEMEN'S COMMITTEE (Bristol), The LADIES' COMMITTEE (Bristol), The LADIES' COMMITTEE (Clifton), The WORKING MEN'S COMMITTEE (Greenwich), The LADIES' COMMITTEE (Woolwich), The LADIES' COMMITTEE (York), The LADIES' COMMITTEE (Belfast), The CANTERBURY COMMITTEE, The OXFORD COMMITTEE, The COLCHESTER COMMITTEE, The LADIES' COMMITTEE (Reading), The WOMEN'S COMMITTEE (Nottingham), The LADIES' COMMITTEE (Alloa), The GENTLEMEN'S COMMITTEE (Maidstone), The MORAL REFORM UNION.

Mr. STANSFELD, who on rising was greeted with cheers, again and

again renewed, said:—Ladies and gentleman, I took upon myself to call this Conference that I might speak to you in an informal manner, and perhaps you will now allow me to occupy the chair without being formally voted to that office. I am not going to make an oration; I am here to make a plain, business statement; to tell you that the time for action, or what I call business—for I like that old English word—is at hand. It is true that the Committee of the House of Commons, which has sat for three sessions on the Contagious Diseases Acts (and of which I am a member) has not yet reported, and does not appear to be very near to the point of making a report. Nevertheless, before the close of the last session of Parliament, I thought it my duty—exercising that full and free liberty of judgment and discretion upon which terms alone I undertook the conduct of this question in the House of Commons—I felt it my duty to give notice that during the next session of Parliament I would introduce the subject; that I would invite, and I would obtain, if possible, a decision of Parliament upon this question. While I have to justify that proceeding to you, I do not affect to believe that you will be a jury particularly difficult to convince. Because—if I read your minds aright—you have been waiting with some degree of impatience—(hear, hear)—and even bewilderment for the time of action to arrive. (Hear, hear.) But I have to justify it, because within the limits of Parliamentary action, I am responsible, and it is an exceptional step to take, to announce, as I have announced, that even if the Committee which is sitting upon these Acts, and of which I am a member, should not have reported before the expiration of next session, I will so far as I may be able, appeal to the judgment of Parliament on the subject. (Hear, hear.) Well, now, I proceed to justify that course to you. First, let me give you some of the dates and history of this Committee. The Committee was appointed on the 11th of June, 1879. I am not responsible for its appointment, but I have been a member of it and have borne on the whole, as I believe, the most laborious part. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) It sat for one month in that session; was re-appointed in February, 1880, and then sat twice, to hear Dr. Nevins' evidence, before Parliament was dissolved. It was re-appointed in the first session of the new Parliament but, after repeated delays, it adjourned without having once met for business.

It was re-appointed in January, 1881, but did not meet until February 23rd. Previously it had met sometimes twice a week, and often only once a week; but owing to pressure which I put upon the Committee during the last session, it sat generally twice a week. It adjourned on July 28th (although Parliament sat for nearly two months longer), upon the motion of Mr. Osborne Morgan, the Judge Advocate-General and the representative of Her Majesty's Government upon that Committee, supported by the pro-Acts members of the Committee, against the objections of myself and of the Repeal members who sat with me on that Committee. If it had not been for this action on the part of the representative of Her Majesty's Government we might have made much more progress in the discussion. This brings me to the question of the changes of persons on the Committee, but I do not think I need refer to more than one of those changes specifically. When the present Government was formed we lost one very intelligent and earnest friend in Mr. Shaw Lefevre; a man full of energy, with a large capacity for usefulness upon our subject; he felt, no doubt, that upon taking office under a new Government, he would wish to have his hands free from laborious and painful duty in connection with a subject of such great responsibility as ours. His place was taken by Mr. Osborne Morgan, the New Judge Advocate-General. Now I am about to speak to you with perfect frankness. I desire to have no secrecy, no affected, dishonest courtesy in this matter. In exchanging Mr. Lefevre for Mr. Osborne Morgan we have lost a trustworthy and intelligent friend, and have gained an opponent; and the mischief, and the bitterness (for the Liberals amongst us) lies in the fact that this opponent is the nominee on the Committee of Her Majesty's Government. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Osborne Morgan has, in my opinion, played the part on that Committee of a partisan advocate. (Hear, hear.) He has defended every official down to the meanest policeman engaged in the administration of the Acts. (Hear, hear.) There is nothing which—according to Mr. Osborne Morgan—is not beneficial in the operation of these detestable Acts, and above all in their moral influences. If any one will take the trouble to read through his examinations and cross-examinations of witnesses before that Committee they will recognise the truth of what I say. (Cheers.) Mr. Osborne Morgan has so played his part as to outrage Members of

Parliament upon that Committee who are opposed to this legislation. He has sat there as the advocate of the Acts. He has neighboured with those who agreed with him, and turned aside from those opposed to this legislation as if they were beneath the notice of his new, official eye. You will not imagine that he has been allowed to pursue this course without an occasional reminder, and what I say about him I say simply because he is the representative, on that Committee, of the present Government. (Hear, hear.) I have made representations to the Government upon the subject, and what I said to them I now repeat to you to-day. Either he represents them or he does not; if he does represent them, then they are our opponents on this subject; if he does not represent them, it is time for them to look after him lest he should commit them too far. (Hear, hear.) Now, as to the progress made on that Committee. We have finished the hygienic question. But this is but the fringe of the great subject. (Hear, hear.) I have always said, and I repeat it here, that, to my mind, the most damning evidence against the Acts would be the proof of their complete hygienic success. (Loud cheers.) And I do not say this from the moral standpoint only; I say it from the hygienic standpoint; from the most lofty hygienic standpoint. If you could, by this legislation, guarantee what you profess to guarantee, that people might practice sexual vice without incurring the danger of the diseases incident to vice, you would not only demoralize the people, but you would physically degenerate and ruin the population. (Hear, hear.) Those members of the medical profession who are unable to rise to the conception of this hygienic argument, are grovelling in the mud of the specialisms which weaken and contaminate their minds. But we have got to the end of the mere hygienic question. On the question of the army medical statistics and the vaunted results and success of this legislation, I think I have somewhat of a special right to point out to you the great success which we have obtained. No doubt, it has not been possible for all of you to follow carefully the reports of the examinations and cross-examinations of the medical witnesses before this Parliamentary Committee. Many of you may have read the epitomes of these examinations and cross-examinations which have appeared in *The Shield*. It is impossible for me to express too high an opinion of the marvellous justness and accuracy of those resumé's. (Hear, hear.) Extreme accuracy and judicial com-

pleteness characterize that work, but I am bound to admit that something more is wanted for those who can only read as they run. They want to know the questions as well as the answers to them, and therefore I assume (though no fault do I find in the admirable works of art to which I have alluded), that to a certain extent many friends of Repeal may not be fully conscious of the tremendous victory that we have won. (Hear, hear.) Let me show it to you. When I first entered on this movement I began with the conviction which I unhesitatingly expressed, that there was no such thing conceivable—under the divine law which governs human life—as any truly sanitary and at the same time immoral, human law. (Hear, hear.) Of this I was so profoundly convinced that I did not only believe it in that larger sense, but I believed it in the narrower, immediate sense; and I said: I will seek and I shall find, detect and expose the imposture, the miserable pretence of an hygienic success which the advocates of the Acts put before the public. (Loud applause.) And the truth of this conviction with regard to the hygienic question has been proved out of the mouths of our opponents' own witnesses. (Hear, hear and loud cheers.) Now I will tell you what has been shown out of their own mouths before this Parliamentary Committee which has occupied our time and kept you comparatively inactive, but which has, none the less, been of immense importance. First of all there was the argument of the reduction, or what was called the reduction, of the inefficiency of the forces. What we have accomplished is this—we have compelled the medical advocates of this system and the representatives of this law to put their conclusions into figures, and to explain the methods of their calculation. By cross-examination we have got upon the minutes some very important results. One of the first things Sir William Muir said was that he had shown in the year 1875, to the Secretary of State, that the saving in the army was 190 men per annum. The meaning of that is—as I put it—that 190 men were on parade instead of being in hospital, and in cross-examination he repeated the figures, and said, “yes; that is the total saving.” But a month or two after, when we had the proof of his evidence, we found a note that he should not have said 190—that the real saving was of 300 men. Then as the advocates of the Acts could make nothing of Sir William Muir, they called that hard-headed Scotchman, Ex-

Surgeon-Major Lawson. But one difficulty with which they had to contend was, that these two never agreed ; and when the time for arguing this question in the House of Commons comes, I shall call upon the Government to elect between these two advocates of their system ; to choose which they will have, and tell them, " You can't choose both, for they take quite different views." Mr. Lawson was put forward as a witness of great strength, and I elicited from him a definition of the grounds and the method of his calculation, and the result of this cross-examination was as I think to entirely put their figures and calculations out of court, and to confirm my own. I say this without hesitation, but of course it is a matter of opinion. For my present purpose it is enough for me to say that the whole question of saving of inefficiency is now thoroughly threshed out ; that no further inquiry of any extent is necessary or possible, and that it is now for Parliament to judge between these gentlemen and myself. (Hear, hear). Now as to the reduction of disease. In speaking on this subject in public, I never use medical terms, I think I can make myself clearly understood without them. You are aware that in the army medical statistics they divide the diseases which are the consequence of sexual vice into two classes. One of these classes is confessedly local and non-constitutional ; about the other there is some question. With regard to the confessedly local and non-constitutional class it has been admitted that the Acts have had no success whatever. Mr. Lawson attempted to argue the success of the Acts from the diminution of admissions to hospital after 1873, in which year Lord Cardwell's Order came into operation, but it had been previously admitted by them that the whole statistics of disease issued after Lord Cardwell's Order were invalidated by the fact that that Order led to the concealment of disease. Up to that year it was admitted by the army medical reports and by the witnesses themselves, that the Acts had had no effect whatever in respect of this non-constitutional class of disease. With regard to the second class of disease most of which is also non-constitutional and merely local, I say that the cross-examinations of the medical witnesses who were called in support of the Acts prove our figures, showing a limited reduction, and not their sensational figures. You will remember that in their calculations they went back to years before the Acts were in operation to get a higher standpoint from which to show a fall—but

my point to the contrary was a simple one. I found, on analysing it, that there was a given period in that series when the Acts were only partially applied, in which the proportion of disease was larger among the protected than among the unprotected men in the ultimately subjected stations, I therefore said: You must begin there, and you must not take credit for any previous reduction which evidently cannot be attributed to the Acts. Then we came to the question of the real constitutional disease about which so much has been said and written as to the extent to which society is interested in it, because it is said that it may affect the constitutions of children yet unborn, and about which, therefore, they make so great an outcry. Up to the time of this Committee, the army medical department had always said we could not distinguish the amount of this specific disease station by station, because when the secondary symptoms arise we do not know to which locality to attribute the primary infection; therefore they declined to give the secondary symptom returns. But being hard pressed they put Mr. Lawson forward with some new figures. It was found that in the whole Home army there was no diminution whatever, during the period that the Acts have been in operation, in the amount of constitutional disease as evidenced by the existence of the secondary symptoms. Ex-Surgeon-Major Lawson set to work and produced a return, station by station. But what did this return show? First of all it showed that in the subjected districts, the proportion of constitutional to non-constitutional cases increased year by year under the influence of the Acts. That is to say, it showed conclusively that the main effect of the Acts—wherever there had been a reduction—had been in the non-constitutional cases. And further, their figures showed, taking station by station, that there was no change whatever in the relation between the two classes of stations—on the one hand before the Acts and on the other hand after the Acts—with respect to the average constantly sick from these secondary causes. Now, have you followed me in what I have said? If, between two separate groups of stations, which are compared to prove the value of certain Acts of Parliament, you find a certain relation existing before those Acts came into operation and that the same relation continues to exist after these Acts came into operation, is that not evidence sufficient to the mind of any child in a national school, that these Acts have

produced no effect? (Hear, hear.) This is proved out of their own figures as far as the constantly sick are concerned. It is true that these figures—if we believe them as Gospel—show a more rapid diminution in subjected districts, in the number of admissions of the secondary symptom cases—but when we find that the proportions of the constantly sick remain the same, what is the conclusion? As a mere arithmetical calculation, the conclusion is that the effect of these Acts was to detain the patients longer in hospital, and the inference is almost inevitable that the cases were more severe. I believe that this is the opinion of the National Medical Association, represented here by Dr. Carson. Now, I ask you if I have stated the case correctly to you, without going to our own medical witnesses, but simply by taking the admissions of our opponents, whether our case is not in a position at the present time to be presented to Parliament without any further delay? (Loud applause.) But we are much more deeply indebted to the medical witnesses for the Acts than I have shown you. I will explain to you now the extent of our debt. Sir William Muir, Ex-Surgeon-Major Lawson, and Dr. Barr of Aldershot, have made admissions which I say distinctly ought, and which I devoutly hope will, prove fatal to the whole system of the Acts. They have each made their admissions, they have each made their contribution to the good cause, and I will give you now the contribution of each. We have always said that the comparison between the two classes of stations was unsound and unfair. To compare a camp with a small civil population in its neighbourhood, with a station in which a small force is situated near to, or in the metropolis, or any large manufacturing town, is, evidently, monstrously unfair, and if you will look to the figures of the unsubjected districts, you will see that there is no comparison between the large towns and the smaller. Strike out London, Dublin, and one or two other places, and you see plainly the comparative innocence of the unprotected stations. We have always said that, but that is of course a mere matter of opinion and of argument. But at the same time I have always said about the medical statistics that I did not believe them to be intentionally unfair, and I will say that even now; but, without charging their compilers with intentional fraud, I may say that they are marvellous instances of the way in which partisanship and a kind of trades' unionism pervert the intellect and blind the judgments of

men. What did we hear to our amazement from Sir William Muir? I have the book before me—

“On the first arrival of troops at stations in the United Kingdom, to which the Contagious Diseases Acts apply, or on their return from furlough, they will be examined with a view to prevent the introduction of such disease.”

That is to say, to prevent their spreading the disease among the women who are provided and set up as fit for prostitution by the Government, for the use of the men in that district. Whenever a regiment goes into an unprotected district, or a soldier returns from furlough there, he is as deliberately let free to propagate disease among the poor prostitutes in that district. And of course there is no mistake about it—that is the printed regulation. There is no qualification about it, and it will give you an illustration of the way in which a narrow officialism and partizanship blind the judgment of men. The medical witnesses informed me that this was done to secure a fair trial for the great experiment! (Laughter and applause.) I have not too exalted an opinion of the morality or the judgment of men, but there is some notion of justice, I believe, in the British legislative mind, and I really pity the sensations of these men when I show to the British Parliament the fact that they have—very unconsciously—committed frauds upon Parliament and the public by doing something worse than cooking statistics; by cooking the facts upon which their statistics are to be founded. (Hear, hear.) The contribution of Surgeon-Major Lawson is at least as valuable. He told us that at a certain date he visited Aldershot to make certain inquiries into the existence of disease in the regiments there. He told us frankly—I will give him that credit as frankly as he gave the information—that he found in regiments subjected to the same protection and under the same conditions, differences of this kind: (I am now speaking of the number of yearly admissions to hospital per thousand men for that one of the two classes of disease which contains an undetermined proportion of constitutional disease within it.) He found that the number of admissions to hospital in these regiments under identical conditions in all respects, and subjected to the same protection as far as the operations of the Acts were concerned, varied from 23 per 1,000 to 146 per 1,000. Bear in mind that there exists no such difference between the highest unprotected and the lowest protected stations. Parliament therefore

ought to see, and Parliament will see that the Acts cannot be credited with the reduction to 23 admissions per 1,000 when in regiments similarly circumstanced the number is 146 per 1,000. Parliament ought to see and will see that the difference between 146 and 23 is, in the very nature of things, due to causes exterior to the Acts; due to the character and habits of the men themselves. (Hear, hear.) I will read to you one or two of those pregnant answers of Mr. Lawson to the Chairman who examined him on this point. I examined him afterwards myself, but for the present I take his answers to the Chairman.

(Question 413.) "Do you know whether it was the practice to examine the men in either of these regiments comprised in this last list?"

(Answer.) "In some regiments they took considerable trouble as they thought to secure a low venereal list; and strange as it may appear I found nearly that those were the regiments that presented the highest ratios."

(Question 414.) "The regiments which were best taken care of?"

(Answer.) "No, I do not say that; those who took apparently the most precaution. To give an instance, in the North camp in the case of the regiment with 114 admissions the medical officer was a very efficient medical officer, and took a great deal of care, but the men were inclined to be wayward. In the next regiment with 59 with also a very careful medical man they had a system of night ablution in the regiment to which the medical officer and commanding officer attributed the very low rate in comparison with the other regiment; but I went to the third regiment, the medical officer of which was also a most careful man and the regiment in thorough order; he had no system of night ablution at all, and yet he had less than half the rate of the regiment beside him."

(Question 415.) "The regiment which had night ablution was in a more diseased state than the regiment which had not?"

(Answer.) "Of these two; similarly in a regiment in the west block, they had a system, whether it was vigorously carried out or not I cannot tell, but they had a system that every man who returned to barracks after 9 o'clock, or after tattoo, which would be 9.30, should go into the guard-room, and he had the means of ablution there. But notwithstanding that, the rate was up to 124 per 1,000. In the next regiment to that they had no such system, yet the rate was only 42 per 1,000. It depends vastly upon the customs which exist among the men in the regiment, which one has a difficulty in ascertaining. You cannot get at it except by getting some staid, non-commissioned officer to confide it to you. It is a difference in the habits of the men which I believe is greatly the cause of it, and also the gregarious habits of the men that induce those of one regiment to resort very much with a limited number of females."

You will note that these precautions on the part of the medical men are not taken for the protection of the men from *vice*, but they are taken to

do away with the natural consequences of vice. But nevertheless, the rate was up to 124 per 1,000. Then he sums up thus—this man, approving of the Acts and called there to support the Acts, and it shows the blindness of men—“It depends vastly upon the customs which exist among the men in their own regiments.” (Hear, hear.) That is Ex-Surgeon-Major Lawson’s contribution.

Now I come to perhaps the most important of all, and that is the contribution of Dr. Barr, of Aldershot; but before I give his portentous figures, I must make an explanation. To many of us, very much to myself, a new and marvellous light was thrown upon this hygienic question by our own witnesses, in examination and cross-examination, and I think we are indebted for it to Professor Lee, admittedly about the first expert in England on this subject. It was this—that every poor girl who falls into a life of prostitution almost invariably becomes affected with constitutional disease in the first year. But, mark, that disease, like small-pox, acts as a protection against re-infection. Her capability of *imparting* infection may remain, but it is, comparatively speaking, very rare that she is reinfected with a constitutional attack. You will say to me, “Well, if that is the case, are you not minimising the danger of constitutional infection from the practice of vice?” By no means. She may remain infectious, although it is difficult for anyone, even for the examining surgeon, to know it; because it is not a question of mere outward contact—it is something else—but further than that she may and does become a medium, a channel, conveying the constitutional infection from man to man. I have often spoken in public on this subject of mediate contagion, and I now tell you the result of this inquiry is more and more to prove to my mind that the bulk of contagion is mediate contagion; that is to say, the bulk of contagion so far as these poor wretched women, who are examined, manipulated, and educated for the public service are concerned. The next conclusion to be drawn is, that even if these poor women are protected as far as they themselves are concerned, it is not, in the main, the constitutional disease which the Acts can affect. They cannot obviate mediate contagion. The cases of new infection which they may discover are the non-constitutional cases of the two classes, and the figures produced complete my proof. These figures are produced by Dr. Barr, and I will read them to you. Dr. Barr told us he had been for thirteen years examining women at

Aldershot, and during that time he had conducted 54,848 examinations—"shame!"; that, in 46,867 cases there was no disease; that there was disease in 7,667 cases, and that out of those 7,667 cases of disease, 4,941—more than five-eighths—were of that class of which I have already told you that it is admitted universally on both hands that the Acts have had no effect whatsoever. (Hear, hear.) Two thousand and eighty-five were of that other class to which I have alluded, which is not important, saving in respect of the undetermined fraction concealed within it, of cases which may ultimately turn out to be constitutional. The number of constitutional cases is, in the long run, determined by the number of cases of secondary symptoms, because these secondary symptoms invariably arise, in more or less pronounced form, in constitutional cases. Now, out of the whole 54,848 examinations, only 641 throughout all these thirteen years during which Dr. Barr has been conducting his examinations, turned out to be cases of secondary symptoms. That is Dr. Barr's contribution to the repeal of Acts by which he lives. (Applause.) Now taking the facts I have put before you as proofs of our own previous position vouchsafed to us out of the mouths of our adversaries, I ask you whether the question is not now ripe for the decision of Parliament, and of the general public? (Hear, hear and applause.) I have one word more to say about our own medical witnesses and what they especially deposed. They analysed, criticised, dissected, and tore in pieces the Government returns. They entirely denied the scientific soundness of the Government classification of disease. They repudiated some medical theories which were put forward to justify, but which did not justify that classification, and they succeeded in showing the Committee that the enormous preponderance of medical opinion not only in England but throughout the world was against the particular theory which was thought necessary as part of the justification of the Acts, and lastly, they bore their united testimony to the failure of the Acts themselves, judging them by their fruits. (Applause.) What have I now to say about the character and weight of this authority? Well, we have all of us had reason to know the value of the opinions of our eminent friend, Dr. Routh—(applause)—whom I see here amongst us, and of whom in his presence I cannot now speak. We had also the valuable evidence of Dr. Drysdale—(hear, hear)—an acknowledged expert on this subject, and an admirable witness. We had also the evidence of Pro-

fessor Henry Lee,—(applause)—to whom—and I speak under medical correction in this room,—there is no superior authority on this subject in the British Islands. And, further, we had our own Dr. Nevins—(applause)—of whom I will say that, if you could take all the medical advocates of the Acts and roll them into one man, that collective being would not know nearly so much about the army medical statistics as Dr. Nevins has shown us that he knows. (Applause.) The Government brought forward no evidence except that of army surgeons. I have no doubt that they could have brought other evidence, but they did not do so,—but what I do say is this: they could not by any possibility—and I do not ignore the divergence of medical opinion—they could not have found weightier or higher authority in favour of the Acts; than we actually did bring forward against them. The case I must put to Parliament and to the Government, and especially to this Government, is this: I must ask them, “Will you take the responsibility—of maintaining Acts against which the best of your supporters and the moral and religious *élite* of the country protest on moral, religious and constitutional grounds, upon an exploded medical theory and a divided medical opinion?” I say it is impossible, if they will give their attention to such a statement as I have addressed to you to-day, that the Government can do other than one thing, and that is repeal the Acts. (Applause.) I am prepared with my case. I propose to give a reasonable time, and so far as I am concerned I am willing to compress the remaining evidence, for it is comparatively child’s play to deal with the moral and religious evidence, because they cannot possibly fight us upon that ground. I can, however, assure you that it has not been by any means child’s play to deal with the purely hygienic question. The neck of this iniquity is broken; this it was necessary to do; and if I have helped in anything I surely have helped in that. (Applause.) I shall obtain a day, and I shall leave a certain time to the chance that the Committee may conclude its labours, but I repeat what I have already said: I will not again be shunted or put off. (Applause.) The whole subject so far as Parliament is concerned, is in my hands. That is understood. I have given notice of a Bill, but I must be absolutely free to judge for myself from day to day, as to the forms and occasions of Parliamentary procedure. But we are so near the end that I am not for waiting for another day to get to work. There

are plenty of other matters as to which Parliament ought to be compelled to look into this question. (Hear, hear.) There is the question of the Belgian traffic. I suppose that those who have taken the most active interest in that subject will have arranged with some member of Parliament to take it in hand. Then again, there is the subject of the Hong Kong traffic. That matter I propose to take in hand myself. (Applause.) Then there is the other question of the infamy of our Indian regulations, and lastly there are the Estimates. I say therefore that it is easy to raise our question on these side issues, and it will be our duty to be troublesome to Parliament and the Government upon them all. I could name some members of Parliament now who, when our question comes up, will prove themselves friends, valiant and true; who will remain by my side in these somewhat more aggressive tactics.

And now to proceed: you have a part to perform too. The time is come, or is at hand for you all—every one present—to buckle on your armour, and to get into fighting trim. You must understand that there must be no delay, no doubt, no hesitation, no faint-heartedness, and no unnecessary criticism. Let us all merge criticism in action. (Applause.) The time of trial of this system, and of the principles which underlie this system, is near at hand; but your time of trial is also at hand. Our opponents, relying on their Fabian tactics of delay, have doubtless been hoping, and half-believing that during these days of comparative inaction our courage must have been oozing away, our faith diminishing, and our enthusiasm waning; and that when the moment of actually joining in the fight shall arise they may find that half the virtue has departed out of us. If they find that, I will give them joy. I will give them joy in their day and generation, but shame to us; because that would be the first time in the history of our land when faint-heartedness ever lost a noble and a moral cause. We Liberals—(I speak for myself—and I dare say that most of us are Liberals in this room, but we are not here on a political question)—we Liberals have been considerate with the late Government, because we all felt that they had not been primarily and officially responsible for this national iniquity. We Liberals have been patient with the present Government, because we believed in our hearts that in their own time and manner, they must inevitably come to our aid. But if the

present Government are fairly represented by their own nominee on the Select Committee of the House of Commons, then I warn you that they are our enemies and not our friends. No one has ever been able to accuse me of any want of party allegiance; no one has ever been able to say that I put personal objects above my allegiance to my party's cause. But for myself the time has come for something more than this, and I here declare that upon this subject, I owe, henceforth, no allegiance whatsoever save to my conscience and the higher law. (Loud applause.) And now, if you agree with me that the time is ripe, and that there is no measure of obligation on me to wait any longer; that the case is ripe for public judgment and that I am entitled to take that case to its bar, I say it is for you now at once to come to some determination and to some practical conclusion as to the part that you intend to play and as to the mode of action which you will now take up, and to maintain it actively, persistently, obstinately, until the end be won. (Loud Applause.)

Mr. R. F. MARTINEAU, of Birmingham, Chairman of the Midland Counties Electoral Union for Repeal, then moved the following resolution: "That this meeting, having heard from the Right Hon. James Stansfeld a statement of the present Parliamentary position of the movement for the repeal of the Contagious Diseases Acts and of his fixed determination to introduce a Repeal Bill in the next session, and to ensure a discussion in the House, hereby records its satisfaction at this announcement, expresses its continued confidence in him as the Parliamentary leader of the movement, and urges the several Associations to give him all the support in their power by promoting petitions to Parliament, by interviews with and memorials to Parliamentary representatives and by public meetings and other means which may suggest themselves." Mr. Martineau said he felt that he was only speaking the feelings of those present in saying it had been truly refreshing to listen to this battle call, a call which would be heartily responded to throughout the length and breadth of the land. They should take back to their homes something of the enthusiasm which prevailed in that meeting. The period of inaction had been very trying to many of those present, but now the time for action had come they would do their utmost to support Mr. Stansfeld's endeavours in the coming Parliamentary session. All must rejoice that he had

promised to introduce this question in season or out of season. There would be many opportunities for so doing, with regard to the different analogous questions likely to come before Parliament. (Hear, hear.) The time had come for united action. They would all, he felt sure, be earnest in their efforts to support him to the utmost of their power. He moved the resolution with the greatest pleasure and most perfect confidence of its acceptance by the meeting. If anything had been wanting to convince them Mr. Stansfeld was the man to lead this question in the House of Commons, it would have been supplied by the masterly and excessively able statement to which they had listened. Never were facts marshalled so admirably, never a more complete mastery of facts and figures displayed; nor could any speech upon this great subject have been uttered in a higher and nobler moral tone.

Mr. H. J. WILSON, of Sheffield, hon. Secretary of the Northern Counties' League, said he had the utmost pleasure in seconding the resolution, and in expressing his hearty approval of it, and his great enjoyment and satisfaction in hearing the address to which they had just listened. On behalf of the North of England, he would simply say that they should do their utmost in giving vigorous support to Mr. Stansfeld in any measure and in any line of action which he thought proper to adopt.

Mr. CROSSLEY of Halifax, Treasurer of the Congregational Committee of Repeal, desired to support the motion. Mr. Stansfeld was the representative in Parliament for Halifax, the town from whence he (the speaker) came. He was there to encourage Mr. Stansfeld, if his presence could do so, in carrying out his determination with energy and with zeal. (Hear, hear.) After alluding to the time when Mr. Stansfeld's position as a member of the Government had compelled him to greater reticence upon the question, the speaker said he felt double pleasure in assuring him that Halifax would most heartily support him, and he (the speaker) would assist by every means in his power to strengthen his hands.

Mr. BENJAMIN SCOTT, Chamberlain of the City of London, hon. Secretary of the City of London Committee for Repeal, rose to express his satisfaction with what he had heard that day, and hearty approval

of the resolution. Perhaps no part of the statement which he had listened to had been so gratifying to him as that in which Mr. Stansfeld had stated that time was come when both in season and out of season this matter should be pressed upon the notice of Parliament. (Hear, hear.) One of the most disgraceful facts in Parliamentary history, was the fact that a report like that from the Government Commission of Hong Kong should have been laid before Parliament for two years, a report the contents of which were so terrible, and that not a single question had been put to the Government of England to know what they were doing or intended to do in reference to the disclosures in that report. No more disgraceful or disgusting statements were ever produced to any Government, ancient or modern, Christian or pagan—(hear, hear)—and they had awakened no response whatsoever in Parliament. After alluding in detail to the horrors of the legalized system of prostitution in Hong Kong (which have been published in our pages), and to the revenue derived therefrom by the Colonial Government, the speaker said they must indeed labour in season or out of season—he did not care much which—to have the whole subject dragged before Parliament and before the public. (Applause.) The speaker then inquired of Mr. Stansfeld whether the introduction of a Repeal Bill would be likely to be made a reason for dispensing with the further evidence to be produced before the House of Commons Committee. Judging by the summaries which had hitherto appeared in *The Shield*, he thought that a large portion of the moral and constitutional evidence had yet to be brought forward. He hoped there would be an opportunity of producing evidence on these grounds.

Mr. STANSFELD: I cannot deny that there is an element of difficulty and awkwardness in the course I propose, but I have given my reasons for adopting it, and it is evident you approve of those reasons. No course that can be taken is free from difficulty. I shall give some time to it, but if I have to compress much of moral and religious evidence, it will be because they cannot possibly meet us on that ground. It may be that the pro-Act party on the Committee may meet my move by a counter move of their own. But the course I propose meets your approval and your wishes, and I deliberately think the time has arrived when I, who am responsible for the conduct of this

matter in Parliament, am entitled to say: "you have no right to further delay, no right to put our friends to this unnatural and unfair strain. You have no right to procrastinate indefinitely the decision on this question." Moreover, I am quite satisfied to go to Parliament on the hygienic case, for if they cannot defend the hygienic case they have no case at all; and I have therefore given notice of a day, and have said that it is not possible for me to wait another year. It is a balance of difficulties I know, but I am satisfied that we are on the right course. Does that satisfy Mr. Scott?

Mr. Scott was sure that all present were perfectly satisfied to give Mr. Stansfeld the entire freedom of action which he very properly asked for, but earnestly hoped that some opportunity might be found of bringing before Parliament the evidence of religious persons and ministers who were opposed to the Acts on moral grounds and from knowledge of their effects. He would further say that though born and bred a Liberal he heartily concurred in Mr. Stansfeld's assertion that this question was above all questions of party politics. He should be obliged to ask his own conscience, when the time for voting came, whether he might vote with his party unless these Acts were repealed. (Applause.)

Mr. W. M. JACK said that as representing the gentlemen of the Committees of Bristol, he must express their obligation to, and complete confidence in, Mr. Stansfeld. Perhaps the patience of some of those present had been severely tried by the long waiting, but he had considered it to be exceedingly wise, just as the present onward movement appeared to him to be extremely wise also.

Mr. GEORGE GILLETT, of London, said, on behalf of the Friends' Association for Repeal, that although they had felt during the past year the languid air of the movement in Parliament, they had appreciated Mr. Stansfeld's noble and important work on the Select Committee, and the inaction of Parliament must rest on other shoulders in that House itself. They could not expect him to give his mind and energy to his labours on the Select Committee, and to fight the battle in the House of Commons at the same time; but the Friends would receive with the greatest pleasure the intelligence that there was to be an important aggressive movement next session.

The Rev. J. L. ADEY, Baptist Minister, of Scarborough, said he could claim personal acquaintance with the friends of the cause in Scarborough, and came to represent the local Committee on this occasion. Scarborough was at present represented by a member who had never voted against Repeal, and by another member who was a thorough-going repealer. They hoped to have a good public meeting, and to present a largely-signed memorial to their city members, and he had authority to say that the question was alive there, and now that the time for action had arrived, they would begin afresh, and on going back he should concert measures which would furnish somewhat substantial assistance to Mr. Stansfeld in the question.

PROFESSOR JAMES STUART, of Cambridge, perceived the general feeling of encouragement from Mr. Stansfeld's words. It was as a representative of the British and Continental Federation that he was there, as well as on his own account. This great movement throughout the whole civilised world, which had arisen from the action of a few people here, from Mr. Stansfeld and others in that room; this great movement for law, justice, right, and the law of God, should be adequately supported. He felt justified in reminding them that it now depended upon the men and women present, what should be the result of this great movement during the next hundred years. It depended on them, during the next six months, what should be the future of this movement, and he hoped that the great idea which was prominent with them all would lead them into more vigorous action. The suggestion he had to make was, that in England they could not carry out a great national awakening—a great national cause—and show an example to the world, unless they were willing to make sacrifices, and one of the things in which all could make sacrifices was to deprive themselves of some of the pleasures or luxuries which they were in the habit of enjoying in order to contribute more money to this cause, for money was absolutely necessary. About 150 persons were present in that room, it would not be too hard for them to dock themselves of £5 or so each, and this would produce nearly a thousand pounds. Let everybody take this to themselves, though some of them might give £30 or £40 to this cause. He did not care to what association or society it were given, but it was, in fact, money that they wanted in order to fight their battle in the next six months and money they must have.

That he urged upon them as a practical point. He had read carefully the evidence to which Mr. Stansfeld had referred, and it had left the impression on his mind that, "The Lord hath delivered them into our hands." But he had also observed that in the House of Commons and in the House of Lords—where the traffic in young girls had been considered—the generality of the Committee were advocates of the Acts and they treated the witnesses against the Acts more or less as if they were dishonest witnesses who required brow-beating. And they ought to be deeply grateful to Mr. Stansfeld who had endured at first-hand so much of what had made him (the speaker) feel so indignant when he read of it only at second-hand. (Applause.)

Mr. F. WHEELER, as a representative of the Repeal Committees in the subjected town of Chatham, felt bound to thank their worthy leader and all the friends present for their help and sympathy, for most assuredly it was needed. Chatham had now eighty-four brothels. Anniss, of Plymouth, told us that such houses were visited by his men twice in every twenty-four hours. If this duty were performed in Chatham with half that frequency, say seven times a week, that would make 30,000 police visits in the year, *not* for the purpose of reproof, but of regulating this wicked traffic. The public sentiment of the place was inevitably debauched by this unceasing education.

Mr. Alderman REES, of Dover, said: Their Chairman's antecedents justified them in trusting him fully, both on the constitutional and the moral aspect of the question, but unless the people come to the rescue we were done. He could tell his countrymen facts which would bring them to a white heat to help on the cause. The eye of the nation must look at it and that eye could only see it through Parliament. The worthy Chamberlain of the City of London feared that the moral and constitutional question might be shirked in Committee, but these points would follow in due course. They did not need to convince men that the sun was shining at 12 o'clock in the day. Everyone knew that and everyone knew that these Acts were unconstitutional and immoral, and what they wanted was to have a Bill brought into Parliament and to have a discussion. Their foes were miserable cowards—(laughter)—and they could not go against Mr. Stansfeld. Some of their repre-

sentatives would say: "We never voted against the repeal of the Acts," but they must reply: "Why don't you go like men and vote against the blackguard legislation altogether." He admired the course which Mr. Stansfeld proposed, and he admired his masterly grasp of the present position, and he tendered to him his profound gratitude for the encouragement he had given them.

Rev. H. P. HUGHES, hon. Secretary of the Wesleyan Association for Repeal, said that Methodists would be glad to do their best for the cause. His Church had lately had an Œcumenical Congress in London, which represented twenty-five millions of persons, and he was thankful to say he had succeeded in inducing that gathering to pass a unanimous resolution condemning the system altogether. After describing the representative character of that Congress (a report of which has already appeared in our columns), the speaker urged the desirability of combining a plan of united action among the constituencies upon this great moral question.

Mr. PERCY W. BUNTING, on behalf of the same Association, said he was sure that all present would respond to the call which had come from the chairman that day. He thought that the extremely valuable summary given by Mr. Stansfeld of the medical evidence, which would of course be printed, would afford them just the material they wanted to put before the country so that the public might be informed upon the question up to date. No doubt if the perfectly indefensible system carried out with regard to our Indian army were fully stated in Parliament, the officials would meet it with a denial, although probably in three months afterwards they would recede from that denial, but he thought that a careful collection of the evidence on the subject, seeing that it was authoritative beyond question, would, if put into the hands of some member and laid by him before the House, startle and arouse Parliament into a sense of the infamy of the system.

Mr. WILLIAM SHAEN, as Chairman of the National Association for Repeal, said he was sure that the news of the Conference would be received by all the Repeal Associations with the greatest possible satisfaction and mutual congratulation. As far as the National Association was concerned the change would not be a change from comparative

repose to action, but simply a change of one form of action for another. The amount of work done during the past year had been principally unseen by friends in the country—(hear, hear)—but it was only necessary to look at the Blue Book recording the twenty-five meetings of the Select Committee, each of which might be likened to an important trial in a Court of Law, and had involved an immense amount of preliminary labour to get together the materials to be handled by their admirable advocate and leader, Mr. Stansfeld, as well as a large amount of work subsequent to each sitting, in order that any gaps might be filled up—it was only necessary to look at that Blue Book, and by a slight exercise of the imagination, anyone could form an idea of the important and continuous work that had been carried on. He was very glad to hear Mr. Stuart speak of the money question, because one result of the close attention they had had to pay in London to the details of the work to which he had alluded had been that they have not been able to devote time and attention to the question of the sinews of war, as they had done in former years. But precisely when it had been more difficult to collect money had money been more and more needed. They were on the eve of what he trusted would be the closing contest, and he hoped that the exhortation of Mr. Stuart would tend to largely increase their own contributions and exertions to obtain more from their friends. He was also glad to hear Mr. Hughes's reference to the resolution of the Methodist Ecumenical Congress. But hitherto it had too often happened that those who had thus borne testimony appeared to feel that thereby they had done enough. But a testimony of that kind ought to be considered only as the trumpet call to battle—the battle had to be fought quite apart from such testimonies, and he hoped that the religious organizations would feel that the only real value of a testimony of that kind was the fact that it was held by each individual as a pledge to do some earnest work, and to bring their social and political influence to bear upon their representatives in Parliament. He trusted that their leader would leave this meeting encouraged to renew his exertions, and that he might have further and better support in the House of Commons than he had had in the past.

Mr. STANSFELD here requested Mr. Shaen to take the chair as he was obliged to leave.

Rev. J. P. GLEDSTONE, hon. Secretary of the Congregational Committee for Repeal, said that as all sections of the Christian Church were tendering their support to the resolution, he also did so on behalf of the Congregational Union. Although for a long while that body stood aloof from voting openly upon this subject, they had now officially declared against the system, and he was sure they would all stand by Mr. Stansfeld in his great task.

Miss TOD, hon. Secretary of the Belfast Ladies' Committee, said she was there representing, she might say, the whole of the Irish workers on this subject—not only the Belfast Ladies' and Gentlemen's Committees, but also an important meeting of Ladies from all parts of Ireland, a fortnight ago. All the Irish workers were extremely glad to hear of this Conference, and she had been commissioned to say that they would do their utmost to carry out the suggestions made on that occasion. In Ireland, being further removed from the greater centres of activity, they were able to take a broader view of the matter than those who lived nearer to the work in hand; they saw the flow of the stream and lost sight of the undercurrents. Their feeling had certainly been one of hopefulness. They found that the revelations of the Belgian traffic had awakened interest in quarters within which they had before failed to attract attention. That portion of the question had been spoken of in the newspapers, and moreover that did not appeal to any partisanship in regard to the army or medical men. The fact that so many people had been led to look first at the foreign question and then at the home question was a very encouraging fact. And the evidence of the Select Committee was matter of encouragement to them, because that extremely valuable Committee had, to some extent, the importance generally attributed to Parliamentary matters. Generally, therefore, they should resume work with even more energy and hopefulness than before.

Dr. CARSON, of Liverpool, said there were two points upon which he desired, in the name of the National Medical Association, to offer a few observations. During the past two years that Association had been somewhat resting on their oars, but they felt that the time for resting had come to an end. They were especially indebted to their invaluable President, Dr. Nevins, for the immensely important evidence he had

given before the Committee of the House of Commons. He had thought and his opinion had been paramount with them, that it was more becoming while the legislature had solemnly referred the matter to the Select Committee of the House of Commons, to suspend the general agitation. But now that the hygienic case had been so clearly put before the Committee, they thought they should actively agitate in the future. In their last meeting they did not confine themselves—they never had done so and never should—to the simple hygienic question. From much of what had occurred in certain portions of Her Majesty's dominions, they feared that the course of the present Government would not in the future be guided so much by the needs of true progress as of Parliamentary expediency, and he was instructed to support in the strongest manner this noble determination of Mr. Stansfeld to fight the battle without regard to any flimsy Parliamentary notions. The Medical Association had had before their minds the terrible prospect that all the doctors in Europe, or at least the flower of them, united in Conference in the metropolis, might present an united requisition to all the Governments in Europe calling upon them in the interests of an imaginary or baseless hygiene to extend the infernal system to all Europe, and base it on International Law. They had had that prospect before them. They determined to put an end to it, and he was proud to say they had completely done so. Although a medical man, he claimed to speak impartially, because, although they had been occupied with the hygienic question, he did not care the fraction of a farthing for any results of the hygienic system. He could give them no true impression of their former suspense, nor of their satisfaction when attending the International Medical Congress. It would be impossible for him to overstate the utter scientific, intellectual, and he might almost say the vocal incompetence of the gentlemen who presumptuously presumed to defend the system. (Laughter.) He could not exaggerate the feebleness, the imbecility, the absurdity of it, and could only say that it was on a par with the intellectual and moral insight displayed by the same parties. The opponents of the Acts—both in the section of Public Health and afterwards in the section of Military Surgery—had speakers in the proportion of two to one. So much for numbers. As to quantity they each filled up the ten minutes allotted to them, and were prepared to fill up a great deal

more, whereas on the other side the speeches ranged from three minutes to five minutes, and were generally—he might say all, with one exception—mere screeches. The one exception was that of Inspector-General Lawson, and they had the satisfaction of saying to Lawson, “You ask us to accept your statistics, will you tell us when you are going to accept them yourselves?” He (the speaker) said to him—as he was close to him—“I divide your statistics into three classes; First, those which as yet remain unchallenged by you; secondly, those which you have withdrawn, and substituted others for on account of errors; and thirdly, those which you have absolutely withdrawn, and for which you have not substituted anything.” At the beginning of the sitting their polite confidence was everything that the most fastidious man could demand; at the end of the *séance*, if he were to say that their features betrayed rage and shame combined, it would not be too much. The thing ended at last in the subjects necessary to be treated being simply brought on, and no resolution was proposed. And he might say that he did not believe that any of the partizans there would have had the assurance to have risen and proposed a vote of confidence in the system. But although that was the case, he warned the Conference that those gentlemen were silenced but not convinced. They retained the same prejudices and the same desire to pander to those whose sons are in danger from vice, but whose daughters are safe from being subjected to the Acts, viz., the upper classes. He was instructed to adjure them not to let anything stand between the Associations and the great work, on the one hand of instructing the country by every means possible, and on the other hand, of giving full, loyal and cordial support to their Parliamentary leader. He would further suggest that the public meetings called during the coming winter should be called expressly in support of some particular phase of the Parliamentary work.

The Rev. C. S. COLLINGWOOD, hon. Secretary of the North-Eastern Association, said they would be greatly encouraged by what had occurred that day, and all of them must have felt the greatest satisfaction in hearing Mr. Stansfeld's speech. His feeling in regard to Mr. Stansfeld's leadership had always been one of unbounded confidence. If anywhere any doubt had been felt, he felt sure those doubts were removed; and all present must feel that the cause was in the best possible hands, and that

they had nothing whatever to fear, but everything to trust for the carrying on of the work. He confessed he had felt some shame when the Rev. Mr. Hughes, who represented the Methodist Church, and the Rev. Mr. Gledstone, who represented the Congregational Church, spoke of the action which their churches had taken in the matter, to remember that the Church of England, to which he belonged, had as yet taken no part, but he hoped the time was coming when the Church of England would speak out as one man against the infamous Acts. He was glad that Mr. Stansfeld was prepared to take up the Chinese and the Indian questions, which ought to be thoroughly threshed out. Mr. Collingwood then made suggestions as to methods of work for the consideration of the Conference, after which

Mr. EDMONDSON, Halifax, alluding to what Mr. Stansfeld had said in reference to the work to be done inside the House of Commons, expressed a strong hope that they would not forget to raise discussion upon the case of Elizabeth Burley. A great deal of notice had been taken of Elizabeth Burley's case, and he for one should not feel satisfied until the Home Secretary were made to apologise for the injury which he had inflicted upon that young woman. With regard to work outside the House he thought it would be of immense importance if some of the Parliamentary friends of the cause, of whom Mr. Stansfeld had spoken, would attend some of the public meetings on the subject, which it was intended to hold before next session.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Shaen) having made several suggestions as to the modes of agitation to be adopted—the arrangements for and conduct of public meetings, &c.—

Mrs. TANNER, of Sidcot, Weston-super-Mare, said: That before the resolution was put, she desired, as one of the representatives of the Ladies' National Association, to declare their most hearty and earnest approval of the resolution, and to promise in the name of the Association that they would do all in their power to support Mr. Stansfeld in his great work.

The CHAIRMAN then re-read the resolution to the meeting, after which it was carried unanimously amidst applause.

The meeting then separated.

LIST OF THE PRINCIPAL ASSOCIATIONS AND COMMITTEES FOR THE REPEAL OF THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS AND THE ABOLITION OF STATE-REGULATION OF VICE.

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION: 2, Westminster Chambers, London, S.W.—W. SHAEN, M.A., *Chairman*. W. T. MALLESON, B.A., *Vice-Chairman*. FREDERICK C. BANKS, *Secretary*. BARCLAY, BEVAN & Co., *Bankers*.

THE LADIES' NATIONAL ASSOCIATION: 348, Park Road, Liverpool, and 2, Westminster Chambers, London, S.W.—Mrs. J. E. BUTLER, *Hon. Secretary*. Mrs. M. TANNER, *Treasurer*.

THE NATIONAL MEDICAL ASSOCIATION.—J. B. NEVINS, M.D., 3, Abercrombie Square, Liverpool, *President*. W. CARTER, M.D., 74, Rodney Street, Liverpool; T. CARSON, M.R.C.S.I., 206, Upper Parliament Street, Liverpool, *Hon. Secretaries*.

THE MIDLAND COUNTIES' ELECTORAL UNION: 20, Paradise Street, Birmingham.—R. F. MARTINEAU, *Chairman of Committee*. JESSE HERBERT; W. MORGAN, *Vice-Chairmen*. J. E. BAKER, *Treasurer*. A. J. NAISH; T. WORTH, M.R.C.S., *Hon. Secretaries*. Rev. W. WASTELL, *Secretary*. J. CRAIG, *Financial Secretary*.

THE NORTHERN COUNTIES' LEAGUE.—Rt. Hon. LORD DERWENT, *President*. H. J. WILSON, 255, Pitsmoor, Sheffield, *Hon. Secretary*. J. EDMONDSON, Heath Avenue, Halifax, *Treasurer*.

THE WESLEYAN METHODIST ASSOCIATION.—P. W. BUNTING, M.A., 18, Endsleigh Gardens, Euston Square, N.W.; Rev. H. P. HUGHES, B.A., Selbourne Villa, Black Hall Road, Oxford; Rev. A. REES, 23, Bridge Road, West Battersea, S.W., *Hon. Secretaries*.

THE FRIENDS' ASSOCIATION: Offices, Queen Anne Chambers, 1, Poultry, London, E.C.—WILLIAM FOWLER, M.P., *President*. F. WHEELER, Rochester, *Chairman of Committee*. GEORGE GILLETT, 72, Lombard Street, London; JOSEPH EDMONDSON, Halifax; BARTON DELL, Bristol; A. J. NAISH, Birmingham, *Hon. Secretaries*. A. S. DYER, *Secretary*. SAMUEL GURNEY, *Treasurer*.

THE CONGREGATIONAL COMMITTEE.—Rev. J. P. GLEDSTONE, Tulse Hill, S.W., *Hon. Secretary*. EDWARD CROSSLEY, Halifax, *Treasurer*.

THE BRITISH AND CONTINENTAL FEDERATION FOR THE ABOLITION OF STATE-REGULATED PROSTITUTION: 2, Westminster Chambers, London, S.W., and 348, Park Road, Liverpool.—JAMES STUART, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Mechanism in the University of Cambridge, *Financial Secretary*. Mrs. J. E. BUTLER, 348, Park Road, Liverpool, *Hon. Secretary*.

THE CITY OF LONDON COMMITTEE: 69, Basinghall Street, E.C.—S. MORLEY, Esq., M.P., *Chairman*. WM. McARTHUR, Esq., M.P., *Vice-Chairman*. R. C. L. BEVAN, *Treasurer*. BENJAMIN SCOTT, F.R.A.S.; JAMES B. PORTER, *Hon. Secretaries*.

THE WORKING MEN'S NATIONAL LEAGUE: 1 & 2, The Poultry, London, E.C.—EDMUND JONES, *President*. JOSEPH JOYCE; SIDNEY GOULT, *Secretaries*.

THE NORTH-EASTERN ASSOCIATION.—Rev. C. S. COLLINGWOOD, M.A., Rector of Southwick, Suderland, *Hon. Secretary*. FREDERICK CLARK, 5, Summerhill Grove, Newcastle-on-Tyne, *Treasurer*.

THE MANCHESTER DISTRICT ASSOCIATION.—R. HAWORTH, J.P., Didsbury, *President*. CHARLES HERFORD, 17A, Cooper Street, Manchester; EDWARD P. RIDGWAY, 71, Market Street, Manchester, *Hon. Secretaries*.

THE MANCHESTER LADIES' ASSOCIATION.—Mrs. C. O'CONNOR, 124, Upper Brook Street, *President*. Mrs. M. J. HERFORD, *Treasurer*. Mrs. R. WHITELEGGE, 11, Greenhill Street, Greenheys, *Hon. Secretary*.

THE BIRMINGHAM LADIES' ASSOCIATION.—Mrs. S. SOUTHALL, Wellington Road, Edgbaston, *Treasurer*. Mrs. H. P. KENWAY, 37, Carpenter Road, Edgbaston; Mrs. L. STAMPS, 46, Calthorpe Road, Edgbaston, *Hon. Secretaries*.

THE BRISTOL GENTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION.—W. H. BUDGETT, J.P., *Hon. Treasurer*. P. WATSON, Tower Leaze, Stoke Bishop; J. STORRS FRY, Charlotte Street, *Hon. Secretaries*.

THE BRISTOL LADIES' ASSOCIATION.—Mrs. L. THOMAS, Stoke Bishop, *President*. Miss MARY A. ESTLIN, 36, Upper Belgrave Road, Clifton; Miss MARY PRIESTMAN, 9, Durdham Park, *Hon. Secretaries*.

THE CLIFTON LADIES' ASSOCIATION.—Mrs. A. J. BUDGETT, Stoke House, *Treasurer*. Mrs. M. WILLIAMS, 1, Lansdowne Place; Miss N. PRICE, Pembroke Road, *Hon. Secretaries*.

THE LEEDS LADIES' ASSOCIATION.—Mrs. H. FORD, Adel Grange, *President*. Mrs. CELIA WALKER, Springfield Mount, *Hon. Secretary*. Mrs. ELIZA TATHAM, Springfield Mount, *Treasurer*.

THE YORK LADIES' ASSOCIATION.—Mrs. H. RICHARDSON, Cherry Hill, *Hon. Secretary*. Mrs. J. E. CLARK, *Treasurer*.

THE SCOTTISH NATIONAL ASSOCIATION: 5, St. Andrew's Square, Edinburgh.—DAVID McLAREN, *Chairman*. Rev. H. CALDERWOOD, L.L.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy, University of Edinburgh; Rev. W. D. MOFFAT, United Presbyterian Minister, *Hon. Secretaries*. W. MORRISON, *Organizing Secretary*.

THE EDINBURGH LADIES' ASSOCIATION.—Mrs. E. P. NICHOL, Huntley Lodge, *President*. Mrs. P. McLAREN, Newington House, *Vice-President*. Miss ELIZA WIGHAM, 5, Grey Street, *Hon. Secretary*. Miss WALLS, 33, Heriot Row, *Treasurer*.

THE GLASGOW LADIES' ASSOCIATION.—Mrs. E. BUCHANAN, 17, Ashton Terrace, Dowan Hill, *President*. Mrs. RITCHIE, 39, Westbourne Gardens, Hillhead, *Treasurer*. Mrs. ELIZA MACLAREN, Clyde View, Partick, *Hon. Secretary*.

THE GLASGOW WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION.—W. HAMMOND, 30, Kirk Street, Calton, *President*. JOHN CRICHTON, 52, Cranston Street, *Secretary*.

THE DUBLIN ASSOCIATION.—H. J. ALLEN, 28, Lower Sackville Street; Mrs. A. HASLAM, 91, Rathmines Road, *Hon. Secretaries*.

THE DUBLIN WOMEN'S ASSOCIATION.—Mrs. M. A. M. ALLEN, Brooklawn, Blackrock, *President*. Mrs. ANNA M. HASLAM, 91, Rathmines Road, *Treasurer*. Mrs. CAROLINE EASON, Kenilworth Square, Rathgar; Mrs. D. WEBB, Highfield Road, Rathgar, *Hon. Secretaries*.

THE BELFAST BRANCH OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION.—Rev. CHARLES SEAVER, M.A., Incumbent of St. John's, 16, Botanic Avenue; Rev. GEORGE SHAW, Presbyterian Minister, Wellington Park; Rev. JOSEPH W. M'KAY, Methodist Minister, College Gardens; JOHN COATES, late Secretary to the Grand Jury, Co. Antrim, Seacliff, Bangor, Co. Down; FOSTER GREEN, Member of the Society of Friends, Derryvolgie, *Hon. Secretaries*. ROBERT THOMPSON, *Treasurer*.

THE BELFAST LADIES' ASSOCIATION.—Mrs. I. K. EWART, Glenmachan House, *Treasurer*. Miss I. M. S. TOD, 126, Albion Place; Mrs. C. S. ROSS, 7, Wellington Place, *Hon. Secretaries*.

THE CORK BRANCH OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION.—H. RICHARDSON, Registrar, Court of Probate, *Chairman*. G. ADDEY, 69, Patrick Street, *Treasurer*. E. A. WRIGHT, 16, Patrick Street, *Hon. Secretary*.

THE CORK LADIES' ASSOCIATION.—Mrs. W. TAYLOR, Fairleigh Place *President*. Mrs. H. E. WHITE, 1, Carolina Terrace, Patrick Street, *Hon. Secretary*. Mrs. SARAH A. WRIGHT, 16, Patrick Street, *Treasurer*.

THE HISTORY OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF THE DEAF AND DUMB
FROM 1815 TO 1880
BY
W. H. WELLS

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF THE DEAF AND DUMB
INCORPORATED IN 1880
NEW YORK: PUBLISHED BY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF THE DEAF AND DUMB
1880

THE OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF THE DEAF AND DUMB
IS AT
100 NASSAU ST. N. Y.

THE JOHN LITTLE ASSOCIATION
NEW YORK: PUBLISHED BY THE JOHN LITTLE ASSOCIATION
1880