STOCKPORT BOARD OF GUARDIANS.

The weekly meeting on Monday was attended by Mr Chapman, chairman; Mr John Chetham, vice-chairman; the Mayor (H. Bell, Esq.), Messrs T. Smith, Sidebotham, J. Smith, Wild, F. Smith, Barlow, Ardern, Bayley, Cooke, Johnson, Travis, Hammond, Melland, Cunliffe, Leather, Thornely, Harrison, Fielding; and the following *ex-officios*: Dr. Rayner, Mr W. C. Vaudrey, Mr S. R. Carrington, Mr T. H. Sykes, and Mr John Eskrigge.

THE WORKHOUSE COMMITTEE

on the 9th inst recommended the purchase of an invalid's tubular water and air bed; and decided to "write off" the sum of £34 10s arrears in two of the relief districts.

HANDFORTH SCHOOL HOUSE.

A letter was received from the Local Government Board intimating that they proposed to issue an order for the apportionment between Bosden and Handforth of the £9 7s 6d realised by the sale of some township property at Handforth.—Mr Cunliffe said when Mr Cane, the poor-law inspector, was over, he premised that an inquiry should be made as to the adjustment of the debt under the Public Works Act. Whenever the inquiry was held, Handforth would seek for a remission of any further payments towards the Hazel Grove sewer.—The Chairman said the contributions could not be remitted. They were levied under a special Act of Parliament.—Mr Cunliffe: Still, Mr Cane, when he was over, said it would be a matter for further inquiry; and that it would be a special inquiry. Whether it will be for the ratepayers of Handforth or this Board to take action I don't know.

THE WORKHOUSE SCHOOLS.

A letter was received from the Inspector of Union Schools, intimating his intention of visiting the schools at the Workhouse on Tuesday, the 1st of October, for the purpose of making the usual inspection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEDICAL OFFICER.

The Board proceeded to the appointment of a medical officer for the Workhouse and for No. 1 medical district, in the place of Dr. P. Downs, resigned, at a joint salary of £160 per annum. There was only one application, that of Mr G. E. W. Turner, late house surgeon, for six years, at the Stockport Infirmary, son of Dr. Turner, of this town. Mr Turner, in his application, enumerated his degrees, and stated that he had previously been at Bethlem Hospital, London, and Coton Hill, Staffordshire.—Mr Hammond moved, and Mr T. H. Sykes seconded, the appointment of Mr Turner.—Dr. Rayner supported it, remarking that the Board could not have a more efficient individual, and he had, moreover, had that practical experience amongst the poor which they would have the benefit of in the Workhouse.—The motion was unanimously agreed to, and Mr Turner having been informed by the Chairman of his appointment, thanked the Board for the honour they had done him, and promised that the responsible duties of the office should at all times have his best attention. (Applause.)

THE ROMILEY ARREARS.

Mr T. Smith asked to be allowed to give some explanation respecting the arrears in the calls from Romiley, as he was not present when the legal proceedings were ordered against the overseers.—The Chairman said Mr Smith could not go into the case now. It was all settled.—Mr Smith said as Romiley was the only township which had not paid the calls, he appealed to the indulgence of the Board to allow him this explanation. Of course, if he was to sit down, he should know what position he was in. He felt, however, that the matter required some explanation, and that he was justified in bringing it forward in order to clear the officials of the township.—The Chairman said they must have the regulations obeyed, and he could not allow the matter to be gone into.—Mr Smith: Very well, then, I can only protest.—Mr Bayley: The best way to protest is to pay the rates. —Mr Smith complained that a matter so serious to the officials concerned should be treated so lightly as it appeared to be by certain members of the Board.—The Chairman: I cannot allow this thing to go any further.—Mr Smith said he did not like to see it treated with such a tone of levity. But it was only what he anticipated and expected.—The Chairman said if he had any grievance to bring before the Board he could do so by giving a fortnight's notice in the usual way.—Mr Smith: Then I will give a fortnight's notice that I shall bring forward the matter against the overseers of the township of Romiley.

THE GUARDIANS AND THE SCHOOL BOARD.

The Chairman (looking towards Mr James Smith, who at the last meeting of the School Board was deputed to bring certain matters before the guardians), asked him if he had anything to bring before the Board.—Mr Smith replied that he had had no official intimation of the matter.—The Chairman said a statement had been published in the papers this week having reference to this Board and the School Board, which on the face of it conveyed the idea that the committee appointed by this Board to hear the applications for school fees had been neglecting its duties. According to the report the complaint was that there were a large number of persons present, and he supposed the inference was that the majority of them were guardians' cases; but it turned out afterwards that only 18 of them were of that class. It was further stated that some of the applicants had been there four or five times, and that there was no one there to receive their applications. Now he had received from Billingham, the relieving-officer, a return of the number of applications during the time he had held the office of inquiry officer—namely, from January 8 to July 30, during which time there was only one omission, and that was during the holiday week; therefore there could not have been any great want of attention on the part of the guardians. Some of the members of the School Board complained that either the School Attendance Officer or a guardian ought to be in attendance; and they also complained that the people could not get their fees. All who were entitled had had the fees—he did not know of a single exception. If they were not entitled, of course they could not have them. The report stated that one person had been there nine times, and when she came before the committee there was no one there. This made it appear that the guardians were very neglectful of their duties. Another member complained that the rooms were occupied with the applicants for fees when the School Board were engaged with their own cases. The guardians, however, commenced their duties at four o'clock, and the latest time he had ever been there was half-past four, whilst the School Board cases did not come on until five o'clock. He did not think the guardians were open to the charge of want of attention. There had been 334 applications for school fees for 751 children from January 8 to July 30; and the number of applicants who attended before the committee was 244, leaving 90 who did not put in an appearance. Fees were granted to 226, for 521 children; and 18 were refused, having among them 40 children. The refusals, in all cases, he believed were capable of explanation.

The Mayor reminded the chairman that there was one week when no guardian attended.

The Chairman said he had not got any return of the cases since Maher commenced the duties of inquiry officer, because, not knowing his address, he could not communicate with him.

The Mayor said that was the week complained of. There was one week—about a fortnight ago— when no gentleman attended, and the people were left waiting until the time that the School Board cases came up, and they got mixed.

The Chairman believed the statements were correct as far as that week was concerned. But according to the reports it would seem as if the guardians were hardly ever near the place.

The Mayor inquired how many guardians were on the rota of attendance.

Mr Duckworth (the deputy clerk) said Mr Chapman was there every week, along with some other guardians.

The Mayor said he felt that the matter required some explanation. When gentlemen accepted a position of this kind, and a rota was formed, they ought at any rate to attend, or get their rota supplied by another guardian. He had thrown out the hint once or twice before that it was desirable a rota should be formed, so that each guardian should know what he had to do. The present mode of informing the guardians a day or two before the meeting, and sometimes on the very day, was not likely to get the best attendance. He was sure the clerk was wishful that the guardians should have every facility afforded them of meeting these appointments; but he was sorry to say they had not received it. He had been looking at the book that morning, since the election of the new Board, and he had found that he was put down six times to attend that rota—one of these being the holiday already spoken of, and Mr Billingham, too, was having his holidays, so there was no business. Out of the remaining five times he had only been advised of two meetings, and one of these came on a Friday morning, to attend the same afternoon, and having to fulfil an engagement out of the town that day he had no time to get his place supplied. It appeared that the chairman had attended 27 times. Because he was an *ex-officio* it was rather hard upon Mr Chapman that he should have all the duty; and he thought the guardians ought and would cheerfully take the duty if they could have a form prepared and put before them showing when they were expected to attend. But if the notices were sent out so irregularly and so late he was sure the guardians might be excused if they did not attend. He should have been glad to have supplied his place, but really he was not able in so short a time. He thought there was some negligence somewhere. He had before suggested that a rota be prepared something like that of the magistrates, with the list of dates when they were expected to attend during the year, and that list being printed would always be before the members.

Mr Bailey said he could quite confirm the Mayor's remarks. He should be very glad to attend the meetings, but he had been informed of them on only one occasion, and he was out of town that Friday. If he knew when he was expected to attend he should be glad to do so.

Mr Hammond said he had received notices of the meetings, but he was one of those who never attended at all. Four o'clock on Friday afternoon was a time he could not come, having to attend to his own business.

Mr Melland suggested that his name and Mr Hammond's should be left off, as they could not attend at that hour. The meetings only occupied about 10 minutes, yet it would be a loss of two hours to him; and he should have to go back to Manchester.

The Clerk understood that a rota should be prepared, as suggested.

MORTALITY OF THE BOROUGH.

Deaths registered in the borough last week:—No. 1 district, nine (three of them children under five years); second district, one (under five); Heaton Norris, five (four children.)

RELIEF STATISTICS.

The number of paupers in the house was—males 233; females, 245; total, 478; corresponding week of last year, 436. Out-door relief was distributed last week as follows:—Stockport district, 479 persons, at a cost of £40 14s 9d, as against 382 last year; Cheadle district, 115, cost £10 10s 0d, as against 87; Hyde district, 156, cost £13 18s 0d, as against 153.

RURAL SANITARY AUTHORITY, STOCKPORT UNION.

The fortnightly meeting of this authority was held on Monday at the Stockport Workhouse. Present—Mr John Chetham, Norbury, chairman; Mr E. Smith, Offerton; Mr Leather, Cheadle Moseley; Mr Ardern, Bosden; Mr Johnson, Stockport-Etchells; Mr Harrison, Werneth; Mr James Smith, Brinnington; Mr Barlow, Bramhall; Mr T. Smith, Romiley; and Mr Vaudrey and Mr T. H. Sykes, *ex-officios*.

THE SURVEYORSHIP.

The members met privately before the commencement of the ordinary business, to consider the course of action to be pursued with regard to the office of surveyor to the authority, the 12 months for which Mr J. H. Carrington was appointed being about to expire. The result of their deliberations was that the Chairman gave notice of his intention to move at the next meeting that Mr James Jones be re-appointed inspector of nuisances at a salary of £110, with an additional £10 as surveyor, for a period of 12 months.

REDDISH PAROCHIAL COMMITTEE.

The minutes of this committee were read and confirmed.

THE MEDICAL OFFICERS OF HEALTH.

Mr E. Smith moved, and Mr Leather seconded, the re-appointment of the medical officers of health, at the same salaries as before, for a further period of 12 months.

EXTENSION OF HAZEL GROVE SEWER.

The following tenders were received for the construction and completion of extensions of the Hazel Grove sewer:—

	£	s	d
T. and W. Meadows, Heaton Norris	440	0	0
John Simpson, Hazel Grove	426	17	0
John Jackson, Heaton Norris	417	5	10
Kellett and Bowden, Marple	360	0	0
Braddock and Matthews	344	3	6
William Bennison, Romiley	332	0	0
John Pickthall and Son	310	2	0
S. Howard and Co., Hazel Grove	305	0	0

On the motion of Mr Ardern, seconded by Mr Barlow, Messrs Howard's tender was accepted.

CONDEMNED PROPERTY AT CHEADLE.

The Surveyor reported that a row of houses near Cheadle Hall, belonging to Mr Tatley, respecting which he had previously made a complaint, were being proceeded with, notwithstanding the intimation he had given the parties that the property would be unsafe. It had no foundations, the walls were not "tied," and the joists of the first floor ran into the chimneys.—Mr Leather: They have happen been blown down yesterday. (Laughter.)—Inspector Jones: It is the most jerry business I ever saw.—The Surveyor: They are worse than Reddish.—The Clerk said if the builders went on with them proceedings could be taken against them on the ground that they were unfit for habitation.

EPIDEMIC DISEASES.

Inspector Jones reported that cases of scarlet fever had occurred in Romiley and Bramhall, and three cases of typhoid fever in Reddish. Two of the latter had been removed to the Stockport Infirmary. Mr Beecroft, the medical officer, reported that in the four weeks ending the 31st August there were registered for Romiley three births and two deaths, the latter being two infants, aged respectively nine and 11 weeks, from congestion of the lungs and marasmus. Several cases of scarlet fever had been reported to him by Inspector Jones, who had carried out the necessary precautions in the effort to limit the extension of the disease. The Werneth rural sanitary district reported no deaths during the above period, and he was not aware of any zymotic disease in the district.

NUISANCE AT CHEADLE.

Inspector Jones reported a nuisance arising from the ashpits adjoining two houses in Stockport Road, Cheadle. The property had not been drained into the public sewer, and before this could be efficiently done the privies would have to be removed.—Ordered that notices be served for their removal.

CRICKET.

Stockport (2nd eleven) v. Improvement (1st eleven). —This match was played at Stockport, on Saturday, on the ground of the former. Score:—

Improvement.		Stockport.	
W Noden run out	2	A McLachlan b A Lee	11
Sherley c Lister b Flanagan	28	T Marsland c and b A Lee	38
J Harrison b Bowlas	0	W Bowlas not out	105
J Ogden c Heywood b Flanagan	4	J Hand b A Lee	11
W Hadfield run out	8	E Torkington b Sherley	32
C Ogden c Heywood b A McLachlan	1	Heywood c and b Marsland	15
W Marsland b A McLachlan	1	W Emery not out	9
A Lee b A McLachlan	1		
W Wood st Marsland b Flanagan	0		
W Breedon b A McLachlan	0		
T Barrington not out	1		
Extras	1	Extras	20
Total	47	Total	241

Fallowfield v. Withington.—On the ground of the latter. Score:—

Fallowfield.		Withington.	
Mellor c Barrowclough b Sharpe	24	Sharpe c Faulkner b Howland	18
Lowther c Darrell b Denison	0	Chorlton c Lowther b Hardiman	3
Weston b Denison	1	Chester run out	8
Howland b Denison	1	Denison b Howland	1
Black run out	0	Nield c and b Howland	8
Tweedale c Chorlton b Denison	7	Barrowclough b Howland	1
Neville c Denison b Barrowclough	6	Pay c Mellor b Howland	0
C Hardiman c and b Denison	9	Lunn b Howland	0
W Hardiman b Barrowclough	0	Leigh c W Hardiman b Howland	8
Ashley b Denison	0	Axon c Black b Howland	0
Faulkner not out	0	Darrell not out	0
Extras	6	Extras	8
Total	54	Total	55

Levenshulme v. Manchester Clifford.—On the ground of the former. Score:—

Levenshulme.		Clifford.	
Hindley not out	65	Bryan b Richardson	2
Taylor b Handley	4	Holroyd b Henderson	5
Higginbottom b Cunningham	30	Ride b Richardson	0
Nall not out	19	Cunningham b Richardson	8
		Okell b Richardson	2
		Blezard c Dobson b Henderson	0
		Handley b Richardson	0
		Jones b Richardson	0
		Massey not out	3
		Moss b Richardson	1
		Barber b Henderson	0
Extras	9	Extras	3
Total	127	Total	24

Brentnall-street School v. Heaton Norris Juniors.—On the ground of the former at Heaviley. Score:—

Juniors.		Brentnall-street.	
W Redfern b Harrop	0	W Lees b W Scott	5
A Brooke b Harrop	0	E Garner b A Scott	43
Taylor c Ponsonby b Harrop	2	J Harrop b W Scott	1
W Scott b Garner	2	J Pestell b W Scott	13
J Pearson b Harrop	0	J Ponsonby b W Scott	1
R Scott b Harrop	0	J Garner thrown out	11
A Turton c and b Harrop	1	E Hamblett b A Scott	2
J Finney b Harrop	2	G Holland b Taylor	6
T Pearson b Harrop	0	J Charles b Pearson	5
H Nelstrop b Harrop	2	W Ashton lbw b Taylor	5
H Jones b Harrop	1	W Harrison not out	0
Extras	2	Extras	17
Total	12	Total	109

Heaton Moor v. Union Chapel (Birch).—Played at Birch on Saturday. Score:—

Heaton Moor.		Union Chapel.	
Cross c Ramm b Haslehams	17	J Brunt b Siepen	8
R Hamilton b Haslehams	1	G Bosworth b Birchall	3
Greaves c Walton b Thomas	33	A Ramm run out	8
A Siepen b Thomas	0	G Haslehams c Hamilton b Siepen	4
C Birchall b Thomas	13	G Conolly not out	14
J Sykes b Haslehams	8	Thomas c Hamilton b Siepen	0
F Naylor b Thomas	3	A Tomlinson run out	4
Lane c Conolly b Haslehams	1	C Conolly not out	8
C Denby b Haslehams	0		
M Barlow not out	2		
Extras	14	Extras	6
Total	92	Total	55

W. and C. Schools v. Cheadle Hulme.—Played, on Saturday, on the ground of the former. Score:—

W. and C. Schools.		Cheadle Hulme.	
J Tempest b Craven	23	W Gibbons b Rome	1
Slack c Gibbons b Craven	21	G Craven c Parr b Rome	4
A Rome b Craven	0	E Cox b Parr	0
G Parr c Craven b Gibbons	2	F Richardson b Rome	0
W Davison run out	2	Colles c Slack b Parr	1
C Stephen b Gibbons	11	Bodell c Davison b Parr	0
M Clarke run out	15	C Wright b Parr	2
J Rome run out	3	Ashwell b Rome	0
G Harrison b Gibbons	6	J Clarke not out	0
F Starling b Colles	7	T Hartley b Rome	0
C Burdimore not out	8	sub. c Parr b Rome	0
Extras	41	Extras	2
Total	139	Total	10

In the second innings, Cheadle Hulme scored 19 for the loss of six wickets.

Walmer v. Oak Hill.—The return match between the above clubs was played on Saturday, and resulted after a hard struggle in a victory for the Walmer by four runs only. Score: Walmer, first innings 19, second 59; Oak Mill, 36 and 37.

Heaton Norris Improvement v. Heaton Norris University.—On the ground of the former last Saturday. Improvement, 68; University, 42.

Heaton Norris Standard v. Heaton Norris Rangers. —Played on the Recreation Ground, and resulted in an easy victory for the Standard. The batting of R. Fairclough and J. Seddon was worthy of note, the former scoring 34 and the latter 31 not out. Standard, 103; Rangers, 50.

Cheadle Heath v. Cheadle Hulme Excelsior.—Played on the ground of the latter. Cheadle Heath, first innings 23, second 33; Cheadle Hulme, 86.

Houldsworth (1st eleven) v. St. Matthew's (1st eleven).—Played on the ground of the latter on Saturday, and ended in a draw. Houldsworth, 104; St. Matthew's, five for one out.

Little Moor Victoria v. Lancashire Hill S.S.—Played on Saturday. Victoria, 17; Lancashire Hill S.S., 51.

WORKMEN'S CLAIMS AGAINST THE CARRINGTON BRIDGE SPINNING CO., LIMITED.

At the Borough Police Court, on Monday, a number of cases of claims for wages made by workmen against Messrs Birtles and Co., of the Carrington Bridge Spinning Co., Limited, excited a great deal of interest and there was a crowded court to listen to the proceedings. The magistrates upon the Bench were the Mayor (H. Bell, Esq.), A. H. Sykes, and J. L. Vaughan, Esqrs., but Mr Sykes took no part whatever in adjudicating the cases. In all there were 15 summonses and it was agreed that the one in which Thos. Allen was the complainant should be taken first. Mr Ainsworth (Messrs Brown and Ainsworth) appeared in support of the claims; and the employers were represented by Mr Addison, barrister, (instructed by Messrs Coppock, Marsh, and Coppock).

Mr Ainsworth said Allen was a doubler in the employ of the defendants. It was some time since he was engaged, and there were then no rules in the mill, none were mentioned to him, and he knew nothing about any rules. On the 29th of August, in consequence of a disagreement, the complainant and fourteen others, who had also summoned Mr Birtles for wages, left his employ. The wages they engaged for were £1 2s 10d per week of 64½ hours. The amount due to each of them when they left was £1 1s 5d, having worked 60 hours. On the Saturday they applied for their wages, and were told they had forfeited them, having left work without giving notice. That was very strange, because only a short time ago in a case in the County Court Mr Birtles himself stated that he had no rules in his mill and no notice on either side was necessary. There were several persons present who had been discharged by Mr Birtles without notice.

Mr Vaughan said Mr Ainsworth could not go into that.

Mr Ainsworth then called Thomas Allen, who said he had worked at the mill since June, as a doubler, at £1 2s 10d per week of 64 hours. During the time he had worked there he had not noticed any rules in the mill—none but the Factory Act. When he was engaged nothing was said about notice. On the 29th of August witness and others sent to the Park Hotel for Mr Birtles, with whom they had a dispute three weeks ago about wages. Mr Birtles came into the street and told a policeman who came up to send them away. They went to him again in the afternoon, and Mr Birtles ordered them away from the premises.—By Mr Addison: It was not because Mr Birtles had discharged a "union" man that morning that we were angry. We didn't say we would not return to work if Chapman was not brought back. It was about two o'clock when we went to see him, and that was the time to start work again. We would not start without seeing him. We thought we were justified in staying away when we thought proper so long as there was no notice required. All we wanted to see him for was that he would not bullyrag us any more. He was always "agate" cursing.— Mr Addison: Then you wanted him to be more polite? Was that it?—It would be ten minutes past two when we saw him, and the engine was running. I don't know whether or not it is any loss for the engine to be running and the hands not at work. The week was made up on Thursday night, and the wages paid on Saturday. I have worked in three doubling mills before, and there were rules in all of them. I belong to a union, but have never inquired whether there were any rules at this mill. I have worked there since June, and when I was engaged nothing was said about notice. Have not seen the notice board produced in the room where I worked.—By Mr Ainsworth: If the notice board had been up I should have seen it.

Mr Addison said the whole of this evidence about not seeing the notices was utterly and entirely false. Mr Birtles had been annoyed out of his life by a union of which the complainants were members. They made one demand upon him and then another, and seemed to think they were entitled to order him about as if they were the masters and he was the workman, until at length he had been compelled to make a stand. It would be impossible to carry on trade if men were allowed to do as these men had done. On the morning of the 29th of August Mr Birtles dismissed one of the union men for bad work, and the complainants demanded that he should be allowed to return to his work. They declined to resume work after dinner until they had seen Mr Birtles, and stood outside while the engine was running. According to plaintiff's statement they sent for their master to tell him that unless he altered his behaviour they would not work for him at all. Upon his own showing he refused to work at a particular time, and that would have been quite sufficient reason for his master to have dismissed him, but he was not dismissed. They walked away in a body, and the master was put to great loss and inconvenience. It would be proved most clearly that there were rules posted in the mill, because the man Sharples who engaged the complainant drew his attention to them. Was it possible to believe that any workman, more especially a union man, would engage to work at a mill without knowing the rules? He ventured to say it was not, and it tried the temper of anyone who had any respect for the truth to hear men say they never inquired what were the rules, and that they had never heard of any or seen any. Workmen engaged on the same terms as these men were, from week to week, who were guilty of any misconduct during the week, forfeited every half-penny of their wages.

The Clerk: So far from that being the case, I have a judgment summons here for half a week's wages.

Mr Addison having referred to the judgement in the case of Walsh v. Whalley, decided in 1874,

The Clerk reminded him that since that decision the law had been altered, and the Magistrates, who formerly sat as a criminal court, now sat as a county court.

Mr Addison: That makes no difference in the weekly hiring.

The Clerk: If there is any neglect on the part of the men, the employer brings a counter summons, and both are heard together.

Mr Addison said he was entitled to ask for a decision on the first part of the case, which was quite strong enough, apart from any rules,—whether the plaintiff could claim for any part of a week, which by his own misconduct he had not completed. After some further legal arguments, he called

Fergus Sharples, the manager at that time, who said he engaged Thomas Allen, and called his attention to the rules. He told him he should want a week's notice and should give one. Witness was at the mill two years and a half.—Cross-examined: It was about twelve months since he engaged Allen. Allen had left the mill since then, but had been re-engaged.

John Sherman, overlooker, said on Thursday, 29th August, Chapman, a doubler, was discharged, and all the doublers had a meeting, and one of the hands said they were going to strike at dinner time. The men went to dinner at half-past one o'clock. At two o'clock the doublers, fourteen in number, did not return to their work. Allen was one of them. He went and told his master, who ordered him to stop the engine. He stopped the engine at 17 minutes past two o'clock. The men were outside, but none of them offered to work. Mr Birtles did not order the men off the premises. The doublers striking threw about 150 men out of work.—Cross-examined: When Mr Birtles came to the mill he passed them without speaking.

James Sutherland said he had worked in the mill six or seven weeks. He did not notice the rules till Friday, when he took them down. Cross-examined: He did not notice any boards with the notices on in the mill. He had verbal notice that a week's notice would be required.

Martha Cartwright said she had worked at the mill six or seven years. Her attention had been called to the rules. She had seen them up lately, but could not say if they were up in July last.

The Bench, after a short consultation, dismissed the case.

Mr Ainsworth, having elected to proceed with another case, called James Alexander Worsley, another of the doublers, who put in a claim for a similar amount. Worsley said he was engaged four months ago. There were no terms of agreement, nor was anything said about notice. He had not seen any rules posted in the mill. The doublers came out because Mr Birtles was always cursing them; they said they would not stand it any longer, they had been "bullocked" enough, and they came to an arrangement to go and see him. They went into the office, and Mr Birtles sent word they were to come out. They then went and stood in the yard, and Mr Birtles told them they must go out of the yard, he would not have them about the premises. They formed a deputation of three to go to see him. Witness was one of the three, and Allen another. When he came out of the Park Hotel they told him they wanted to speak to him. He said he would not hear anything they had to say, and told them to go away. A policeman came up and he requested him to order them away. They went away accordingly, and did not go near again.—Cross-examined: Witness was a member of the union, and all the fourteen were in it. He never heard any of them speak about the notice, nor did they meet to discuss Chapman's dismissal. They never made it up to go to Mr Birtles for anything but to be "gradely" with them, and work comfortably. If he had told them he would not do that, they should not have gone to work.

Thomas Rogers, a jobber at the mill since last Good Friday, swore that he had never seen any rules posted up. He was one of those who left on the Thursday. Mr Birtles had been bullyragging him for nothing, and when he found that the others were not going to start work, he put on his jacket and thought to himself he would "give over an' all."

David Jones, a doubler, had never seen the rules. They met together and decided that they would not start again until they had seen Mr Birtles, and he promised to behave differently.

John Pye, a doubler, had not seen any rules. He admitted that he was one who attended the meeting in the dinner hour.

Mr Addison contended that it was gross misconduct of any servants to attempt in this way to dictate to a master what he should do and what he should not; and these proceedings throughout were most unjustifiable. Could there be a greater breach of a contract than for men engaged from week to week to go in the middle of their hiring, in this way, leave their work, and then claim their wages.

Mr Birtles was called as a witness, and swore that he had seen the rules up in the mill, and that all the hands were engaged upon the terms of a week's notice. These men collected round the gates on the 29th ult. As he passed them he remarked "What! another strike! for an advance of wages," and they did not return to their work. He never ordered them away.—Cross-examined: He was not in the habit of discharging men without notice, except for bad work. He had not used abusive language to some of the hands in the forenoon. He did not say that he never used strong language.—The Clerk: You do all you can to increase your dividends. (Laughter.)—He was getting dinner at the Park Hotel when they sent for him, he sent word they must come out of the office.

The same witnesses as before were called to prove that there were notices up in the mill; and the Magistrates dismissed the case.

Mr Ainsworth thereupon withdrew the other summonses; and the Magistrates declined to grant Mr Addison's application for costs.

THE RAILWAY ROBBERIES.

The preliminary investigation into the charges which have been made, in consequence of the recent robberies on the London and North-Western and Lancashire and Yorkshire Railways, was concluded on Saturday last at the Stockport Borough Police Court. George Harrison, who, as will be remembered, was formerly a ticket collector at Edgeley Station, was again placed in the dock, and the depositions were read over and completed in the case in which he is charged with stealing 26 yards of silk whilst a porter at Middleton Junction in April last. Mr Russell Coppock, as before, appeared on behalf of the prosecution, and at the instance of the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company preferred another charge against the prisoner of having stolen a suit of clothes about the 30th May. It appeared that on the 20th May Mr William Latham, tailor and draper, of Wheelgate, Malton, Yorkshire, sent a suit of black worsted serge clothes in a parcel addressed to "Mr J. Burr, Newton Heath Station, Lancashire. To be left till called for." The parcel was delivered to the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company, and forwarded in due course. It was not, however, called for, and Mr Latham being communicated with gave instructions for it to be returned. The parcel was accordingly returned by William Barton, the station master at Newton Heath, on 30th May. The guard of the train was Thomas Lester, and he received it at Newton Heath, and afterwards put it out at Middleton Junction. There it was taken away along with other parcels by the prisoner, who was a porter, and nothing was heard of it until the suit of clothes was found in one of the prisoner's boxes after the arrest of William Harrison and Constable Westland, who have been committed for trial as participators in the robberies. When charged on Saturday morning by the police with stealing the clothes, the prisoner said, "Yes; they're a nice suit, aren't they?" The Bench committed the prisoner for trial on both charges to the Knutsford Sessions, where the whole of the prisoners will be jointly charged with the robberies. The prisoner repeated the application he had made at a previous court for bail on behalf of his brother, who in his confession he declared to be innocent, asserting that the robberies had been effected solely by himself and Westland. The Mayor said the Bench were disposed to accede to this application providing the bail was substantial. William Harrison must, therefore, if he was liberated find two sureties of £25 each, and be himself bound over in £50.

A MAN KILLED AT A PIGEON SHOOTING MATCH AT BRINNINGTON.

On Saturday afternoon the neighbourhood of Portwood and Brinnington was thrown into a state of great excitement by the announcement that James Bartle, a greengrocer, of Great Portwood-street, and a well-known man in the locality, had been killed at a pigeon shooting match near the Farmer's Arms. It appears that a number of men met in a field on Mr Chatterton's farm to shoot off for 12 suppers arranged for the evening, and that the deceased, although no sportsman himself, was one of the party. He carried no gun, and when his bird was called Joel Thornley, landlord of the Church Inn, Portwood, at his request, stood forward to shoot for him. Thornley had previously shot some half-dozen birds with a double-barrel gun he was carrying, and Bartle chose him as his champion. When the strings were pulled for this, however, the bird did not rise from the trap at once, and Bartle threw his hat to scare it up, and succeeded in doing so. Directly the bird flew Thornley fired, and he was surprised to find, when the smoke had cleared away, that the stock only remained in his hand, and that Bartle was lying unconscious and bleeding on the ground. The gun had exploded, some parts of it had struck Bartle behind the ear, and inflicted a terrible wound, and the scene of merry making was in the course of a few moments plunged into the deepest grief and mourning. Dr. Heginbotham was instantly sent for, and by his directions the unfortunate man was removed to the Infirmary, where in about of hours he succumbed. Upon search being made for the missing parts of Thornley's gun two barrels were discovered a considerable distance in front of where the gun was fired, while the trigger guard, &c., was found close by. The barrels were then examined, and it appeared that three inches at the breach of the right barrel had been blown away. It is supposed that this was the part which struck the deceased, but the piece has not been traced. Thornley almost miraculously escaped with only a slight injury on the left hand, and was naturally very much distressed to see the awful effects of his shot. The deceased's father was on the field, and it was a terrible shock to the old man for his son to fall mortally wounded at his feet. "Fly," he cried, to some men in a trap, who were going for the doctor, and they drove off at great speed for Mr Heginbotham, nearly knocking a man over in the Millgate in their haste. The deceased was a man highly respected, and we understand he leaves a widow and four children, the eldest about 13 years of age. The inquest on the body was held before Mr F. W. Johnson, on Monday afternoon, at the Infirmary.

Peter Bartle, provision dealer, 111, Great Portwood-street, who was greatly affected, identified the body of the deceased as his son, who was in the same line of business at 52, Great Portwood-street. The deceased was 33 years of age. On Saturday afternoon he was with his son at a pigeon shooting match at Mr Chatterton's farm in Bredbury. Joel Thornley and John Redfern were amongst those present. The deceased was not shooting but took part in the match, and when his bird was called Joel Thornley shot for him. The deceased stood at the right-hand side of Thornley, and witness was close behind. As Thornley fired the gun burst and deceased fell back, never uttering a word or opening his eyes. Witness noticed that blood was flowing from behind one of his ears, and a doctor was at once sent for. Mr Heginbotham came, and he said it would be better for him to be removed to the Infirmary. The deceased was then alive, but did not live long after he got there. Thornley had not been long on the ground, and just before he had killed two birds with shots from the same barrel of the gun.

Joel Thornley, of the Church Inn, Portwood, said he was present at the match with a double-barrelled gun. He had shot with the same gun about 14 years, and it had never exploded before. On this occasion it was loaded with an ounce and a quarter of No. 5 and No. 8 shot, which was a small charge. He fired five shots with the gun, two from the same barrel, before the accident happened. He was firing for the deceased, and after it had gone off he found he was left with only the stock in his hand, the barrels being blown away. He happened to hold the gun low down towards the stock, or else his hand would have been blown off; as it was he was only slightly injured in one of his hands. Turning round, after he saw that his barrels were gone, he saw Bartle on the floor injured, and a doctor was at once sent for. Mr Heginbotham came. Witness cleaned the gun about a fortnight ago, and fired it off before he went up to the field on Saturday. He had had the gun about 14 years, having bought it from his brother.—The Coroner: It was an old family piece then?—Mr Thornley: Yes, my brother shot out of it.—The Coroner: You did not know it had any weakness, or that it was at all dangerous, or you would not have shot with it, even for your own protection?—Mr Thornley: No.

The remaining portions of the gun were produced and examined by the jury, who observed that the lower part of the barrel seemed rather weak.

John Redfern, iron dresser, of King-street East, said he was present at the pigeon match and noticed Joel Thornley shooting. The deceased was near Thornley, and witness was only a short distance away. The pigeon Thornley aimed at did not rise as it should have done from the trap, and somebody threw their hat to frighten it up. Then the bird flew and Thornley fired. The barrel burst, a piece of the gun caught the witness in the chest, and the deceased fell against him to the floor "like an ox." Witness observed that blood flowed from behind one of deceased's ears, and he at once thought that the wound was fatal. Thornley was firing in the direction of the bird, and the affair was done before anybody thought anything of it.

James Malpas, of the Farmer's Arms, Brinnington, said he too was present at the match, and heard the gun burst. He was standing at Thornley's left hand, and directly the gun went off and Bartle fell he ran to him. A doctor was at once sent for, and in the meanwhile they rubbed him and applied cloths and cobwebs to the wound to stop the bleeding. Eventually Dr. Heginbotham came, and the unfortunate man was removed to the Infirmary.

Mr Edward S. Newton, house surgeon, said the deceased was brought to the institution on Saturday about 20 minutes past four in the afternoon, suffering from a large wound on the left-hand side of his skull, completely smashing the base of the skull on the one side and the first bone of the spinal cord. He rallied a little, but died in about two hours.—In answer to a juryman, Mr Newton said he could not find any part of the gun in the head; if there was any it had gone beyond probing distance.

The Coroner remarked that he thought it would be clear to the jury that this was an accident, and however sad, one for which nobody seemed to blame.

The Jury at once returned a verdict of "Accidental death," and several of the jury bore testimony to the respectable character the deceased bore, and the esteem in which he was held amongst his fellow men.

The funeral of the deceased took place at St. Paul's, Portwood, on Tuesday afternoon, and was very largely attended, the inhabitants manifesting their respect for the deceased by drawing down their blinds, and some of them closing their shutters.

BOROUGH POLICE COURT.

SATURDAY.

Before the MAYOR (H. Bell, Esq.), S. R. CARRINGTON, and J. L. VAUGHAN, Esqrs.

NEGLECT OF FAMILY.—Abel Sherratt, jobber, Lamb Court, George-street, Edgeley, was summoned for neglecting his family and leaving them chargeable to the Stockport Union. Mr Mason, relieving-officer, stated that the defendant owed £2 16s on behalf of his wife to the guardians, and the case was postponed for him to pay the amount.

DRUNKENNESS.—Annie Kearns was fined 2s 6d and costs, in default, seven days' imprisonment, for obstructing the footpath in Great Underbank.—Elizabeth Nicholson, for creating a disturbance in Higher Barlow Row, was committed to prison for seven days, in default of not being able to pay the costs or find sureties to keep the peace.—Joshua Mason, labourer, Old Road, Heaton Norris, was fined 5s and costs, in default seven days' imprisonment, for being drunk and riotous on the Old Road.—Daniel Madden, of Rock Row, was charged with being drunk and disorderly in Sykes-street, and with tearing the coat of Thomas Reynolds, doing damage to the amount of 3s. The defendant said he was drunk and did not know what he was doing, as a little drink "took hold" of him. He was fined 5s and costs, or seven days' imprisonment for the drunkenness, and 1s and costs and the damages, or in default, another seven days' imprisonment for tearing the coat.

A FEMALE ASSAULTING THE POLICE.—Mary Jones, a woman who said she hailed from Halifax, but of no settled residence, was in custody charged with being drunk and riotous in Higher Hillgate, and, further, with assaulting P.C. Swindells, on Saturday morning. —The constable stated that early on Saturday morning he found the prisoner making a great noise in Higher Hillgate. She was very drunk, and "tumbling up and down," and she would not take his advice and go home. He was compelled to take her into custody, and on the way to the police office she was very abusive and violent. Eventually she got hold of his hand and bit it very badly.—Prisoner denied that she was guilty of any disorderly behaviour, and said she was simply waiting outside a brewery for a female friend.—She was fined 5s and costs, or, in default, seven days' imprisonment for the drunkenness; and 7s 6d and costs, or, in default, 14 days' further imprisonment for the assault.

FURIOUS DRIVING.—John Bardsley and William Bamber, for furiously driving a lurry on the Wellington Road, were fined 5s and costs or seven days' imprisonment each; the Mayor remarking that the practice was a most dangerous one, and must be put a stop to.

MATRIMONIAL FELICITY.—Robert Harrison, a young man, respectably dressed, and said to be a bricksetter, was charged with assaulting his wife, Kate Harrison, who lives separate from him in Stuart-street.—Mr Russell Coppock appeared for the complainant, and said the parties seemed to have had a wretched life together, continually quarrelling and having to live apart. They had been married only about eighteen months, and during that time the defendant had been up three times for assaulting his wife.—The complainant said she was married to the defendant twelve months last Christmas at St. Joseph's Catholic Chapel. On Sunday night last she was with her mother near the Wellington Inn, when her husband came up to them and began using very foul language towards her. Afterwards he struck her in the face, knocked her down, and then "punced" her three times on the side, saying he would kick her legs from under her so that she could not work. She did nothing to provoke him, and did not know why he assaulted her in the way he did. She had not lived with him more than three months since they had been married. While she was living away from him he regularly waited for her and threatened what he would do for her.—Kate Bradley, wife of William Bradley, and mother of the complainant, said the defendant threatened to kill her daughter, and to swing for her.—Defendant said that before he married the complainant she and her mother borrowed some money from a loan society. He knew nothing of it, until a short time ago he got a notice from the society calling upon him to pay it. Afterwards he met his wife in the train coming from Manchester, and, calling him foul names, she said he would have to pay it. On this night he merely asked her what was going to be done about it, and he got nothing but abuse in return.—The Mayor said they considered the defendant had committed a serious assault upon his wife, and committed him to prison for two months with hard labour, without the option of a fine.

NEIGHBOURS AT LOGGERHEADS.—An old woman of the name of Annie Shaw, charged Mrs Thurgoland, a neighbour, in Rosemary Lane, with assaulting her. The complainant said she lived by herself in a cellar, and that while she was getting her tea, on Thursday, the defendant came in and wanted to know what she had been calling her for. Witness told her that she had never said anything about her, and then the defendant pulled her off her chair and threw her on to the floor, repeating it when she got into the chair again.—Defendant: Havn't you called me names? —Complainant: No.—Defendant: Havn't you called me a drunken old faggot?—Complainant: You keep a very bad house, misses. (Laughter.)—Defendant: Can you or anybody else prove that I keep a bad house?—The Mayor: We have not to try that question now. You must confine yourself to the assault. —Mrs Thurgoland said the complainant had been a source of annoyance to her for twelve months, backbiting her and calling her all manner of names. On this day she went no further than the woman's cellar door, and the complainant rushed her out with a knife in her hand.—The Mayor told the defendant she had no business to go to the complainant's cellar at all, and said that if they could not live agreeably as neighbours, one of them had better remove to another locality. The defendant must pay the costs.

LOSING HIS SELF ESTIMATION.—Edward Carter, an elderly man, was brought up on a charge of stealing ten handkerchiefs, of the value of 3s 6d, the property of James Derwent, who keeps a draper's shop in Wharf-street, Portwood. It appeared that shortly after half-past eight on Thursday night, Robert Axon, moulder, Wharf-street, and Jonah Eggington, of Ashton's Court, were standing in the street, when they saw the prisoner go to Derwent's shop door, snatch some handkerchiefs which were just inside the shop, put them under his coat, and walk away. They ran after him, took him back to the shop, and found the handkerchiefs under his coat. Constable Potts was called, and the prisoner was given into his custody. At the Police Office the prisoner said he did not steal the handkerchiefs; they were on the floor, and he simply picked them up. He repeated this statement in Court, and said if the handkerchiefs had been in a proper place he did not think he would have yielded to the temptation. If, said he, they had not been on the floor he should have been an innocent man. Further, he stated, that he was unable to follow his usual occupation because his eyesight had forsaken him. He had a sunstroke whilst in America, which incapacitated him for work.—After listening to his statement, the Bench committed him to gaol for a month.—The prisoner thanked their worships, and, after leaving the front of the dock, turned back, saying he had now lost his self estimation. (Laughter.)

A SLAVE TO DRINK.—Charles Bradshaw, a labouring man, was in custody charged with threatening Jane Bradshaw, his mother, who said the defendant lived with her in Baker's Row, Chestergate, and caused her a great deal of trouble. He could do anything in the shape of work if he would, but he went to the public-house, got drink, and then came home and abused her. So long as he had any money he would do no work, but would keep continually drinking. He was always threatening her, and she was in perfect fear of him. She did not wish to hurt him, but she wished him to keep away from her.—The defendant pleaded guilty, and the Mayor told him it was his duty to protect and not abuse his mother, as he appeared to do.—Mrs Bradshaw: I am an old woman, 70 years of age, and can't do with it.—Defendant was ordered to find two sureties of £5 each to keep the peace for three months, and be bound over himself in £10, or go to prison for 14 days.

INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL LADS IN TROUBLE.—Thomas Doolan, of 25, Carr Green, formerly an inmate of the Industrial School, and William Butterworth, now an Industrial School lad, were placed in the dock together on a charge of stealing a pocket knife, the property of Mr Henry Hollingdrake, ironmonger, Market Place.—Abraham Dobson, of Newbridge Lane, a dealer in poultry, stated that the prisoner Doolan came to his stall, in the Market Place, on Friday afternoon, and offered to sell him a new pocket knife. He asked him where he got it, and Doolan replied that he had had it given to him. Witness next asked, "Who gave it you?" Doolan said "A boy belonging to the Ragged School." Witness said "Tak' it away, it's nowt i' my way."—P.C. Casey deposed that in consequence of something the last witness said to him, he went after Doolan, who, seeing him coming towards him, ran out of the Market Place. Witness started in pursuit and caught him. In reply to a question, Doolan gave him the knife produced, and said that a friend had brought it for him from London. At the Police Office he made a different statement, in consequence of which he apprehended Butterworth, who was errand boy at Mr Hollingdrake's, in the Market Place. Butterworth admitted that he had given the knife to Doolan, and said he had not taken above half a dozen. One he had given to a boy named Flood, at the Ragged School, and another to a boy named Garner.—Mr Hollingdrake said Butterworth had been in his employ about nine months as an errand boy. He did not know that the boy had purloined anything until some knives were shown to him by the police. He had not any reason to complain as to the way the boy did his work, and he did not wish to press the case.—Mr Williams, master of the Stockport Industrial School, said that Doolan left the school about a month ago. He was sent there by the Magistrates in 1875, having committed two felonies. Since he left the school he had been working for Mr Hallmark, saddler, but when apprehended he was out of employment. Butterworth had been in the school since 1874. He was not a Stockport boy.—Upon being formally charged with stealing the knives, both boys pleaded guilty, and elected to be tried by the Magistrates in preference to the sessions. The Magistrates committed Doolan to one month's imprisonment, with hard labour; leaving Butterworth to be handed over to the authorities of the Industrial School to be dealt with.

MONDAY.

Before the MAYOR, A. H. SYKES, and J. L. VAUGHAN, Esqrs.

MISCELLANEOUS OFFENCES. — Bridget Doolan, factory hand, Princess-st., was charged with having obstructed the street in Great Underbank, and pleading guilty, was fined 2s 6d and costs.—Thos. Moores, factory operative, for being drunk and disorderly in Lower Hillgate, was fined 7s 6d and costs, in default seven days' imprisonment.—Bridget Meakin, spinner, for disorderly conduct at Mile End, was mulcted in costs.—Ann Gaffney, Hough's Court, Carr Green, pleaded guilty to being disorderly in Carr Green, and was ordered to find sureties to keep the peace, or go to prison for 10 days.—Lydia Day was charged by Bridget Crowman with creating a disturbance in Chestergate. The complainant said the defendant came to her house, called her all kinds of names, and then when she was in the street pulled her about, tearing her dress to pieces. The defendant denied the conduct imputed to her, and said the charge was brought against her only out of spite and malice. Two witnesses, however, corroborated complainant's statement, and defendant was ordered to pay costs.

ASSAULTING THE POLICE.—Peter Smith, labourer, 29, Providence-street, Heaton Norris, was in custody charged with being drunk and disorderly in Great Egerton-street, and was also charged with assaults on Constables Laughan and Monaghan. It appeared that Laughan found the defendant in a very drunken state, making a great disturbance about half-past nine o'clock on Saturday night. Upon taking him into custody the defendant became very violent, and the constable called a spectator to his assistance. The man assisted him for a time, but went away again. The defendant then kicked the constable several times, and struck him in the breast, tearing his coat. Monaghan eventually went to help Laughan, and on the way to the station house defendant kicked him twice on the legs.—Defendant said he was sorry for what had occurred, but that having had a stroke when he was in the army "a very little drink took effect of him."—Having been several times previously convicted, he was fined 5s and costs, or seven days imprisonment, for the drunkenness, and 15s and costs each, or 21 days' imprisonment, for the assaults on the police.

"MAKING IT UP."—Mr Newton appeared for the complainant in the case of Edward Thomas Nicholson, who at a previous Court had been charged with assaulting his wife, Ann Nicholson, and now withdrew the summons.

ON TRAMP.—John Stockdale and Thomas Wilson, self-acting minders, were charged with begging in Hall-street on Saturday. They said they were out of work and were making their way in search of employment. Nothing being known against them they were discharged on promising to leave the town.

A NEIGHBOUR'S QUARREL.—William Bailey was summoned by Jane Barlow for an assault on the 10th September.—The complainant said on the day named the defendant came to her house and wanted to quarrel with her. She refused to do so, and was walking away when he followed her and struck her and her daughter with a stick.—Miss Barlow and Miss Ford (a young woman who was in the company of Mrs Bailey and her daughter) corroborated, and denied that either the complainant or Miss Ford were intoxicated.—Mr Newton said that as he was instructed the whole story told on behalf of the complainant was a fabrication. There had been some unpleasantness between the parties as to their children, and on the occasion in question Mr Bailey, who was a man in a respectable position, merely asked her what she meant by abusing his little girl. Mrs Barlow made no reply, but immediately rushed at Bailey with open arms, as it seemed to strike him. He then raised his stick to ward off the blow, but Mrs Barlow drew back and it did not touch her.—Mrs Hand, Mrs Leigh, and John Bailey (son of defendant), bore out this statement.—Miss Barlow re-called, showed her arm to the Bench, where there was the mark as of a blow she alleged she had received.—Just as the case had concluded Mrs Barlow, who was stated to be suffering from a serious internal disease, fainted away. —The Bench considered the assault proved, and fined the defendant 10s and costs, remarking that there was no foundation whatever for the insinuation that Mrs Bailey and Miss Ford were intoxicated.

NEGLECT OF FAMILY.—James Duffy, labourer, 32, Howard-street, was in custody for neglecting his wife and five children, and leaving them chargeable to the Stockport Union.—The case was adjourned for a month to allow the defendant to pay what is owing to the guardians.

SECOND COURT—MONDAY.

Before H. HEGINBOTHAM and A. H. SYKES, Esqrs.

SCHOOL BOARD PROSECUTIONS.—Mr Smethurst, the clerk to the School Board, appeared to prosecute a number of parents for neglecting to send their children to school.—Thomas Harrop, Duke-street; Daniel Higgins, Back Duke-street; Samuel Taylor, Howard-street; John Henoughan, Moss-street; Jas. Duffy, Howard-street; Henry Carson, Howard-st.; Henry Chatterton, Ratcliffe-street; Thomas Welch, Astley-street; Rodger Kilduff, Water-street; were each mulcted in the customary fine of 5s, including costs.—The cases of Robert Lomas, Daw Bank; Bridget Melia, Chestergate; William Hale, Hart-street; were adjourned for a month to allow of better attendance being made.

THE QUESTION OF HALF-TIME EXEMPTIONS.—Mr John Percival, who is himself in business at Manchester, and whose wife keeps a confectionery shop in the Hillgate, Stockport, was summoned by Mr Smethurst for neglecting to send his daughter, Phœbe, to school. The facts of the case were admitted, but it was contended by Mr Percival that as a person engaged in business her mother was entitled to the services of the girl if she attended school half-time. Mr Percival said his wife found it necessary to have the girl at home to assist her in the shop and in carrying on her business, and submitted that she was entitled to so employ her. The girl, up to some time ago, had been to a private school, but now she was at St. Thomas's School, and by arrangement with the master was attending 15 hours a week. And as she now went to a public elementary school he held that she could not be compelled, under the circumstances, her mother being a shopkeeper, to attend more. Besides, there were other people who were allowed to keep their children at home who were only in the 2nd and 3rd standards, while his daughter was in the 4th. Under the old Factory Act it was clear a shopkeeper could keep his child at home to assist in the business so long as it attended school 10 hours a week, and his daughter attended 15.—Colonel Reddish: But what says the new Act?—Mr Smethurst said it had quite altered the old Factory Act.—Colonel Reddish: I thought so.—Mr Smethurst pointed out the provisions of the Act of 1876, which he said enacted that no child should be employed at all under 10 years of age, and only under certain conditions, having made certain attendances, and obtained certain certificates, under 14 years of age. Moreover, the Stockport School Board had bye-laws which over-ride all Factory or Workshop Acts. There was a celebrated case which had been taken up by the Barnsley School Board. The parent said the child going to school 10 hours a week was out of the bye-laws of the Board, and the justices held with the contention. The case, however, was carried to a superior court by the School Board, and the decision of the justices was reversed. The bye-laws of Stockport then provided that no parent could claim half-time exemption for a child under the age they were required to be sent to school until they had passed standard four.—Colonel Reddish: So you see, Mr Percival, that before you are entitled to the services of your child in business you must comply with certain conditions and forms. Those conditions and forms you have not complied with, and hence you have been brought here to show that the law must be respected by all alike.—Mr Percival said he should be happy to do whatever the law required, and Mr Smethurst thereupon withdrew the summons.

ALLEGED ROBBERY OF MONEY.—Mary Newton, a charwoman, of Heaton Norris, was charged with stealing 30s, belonging to Samuel Minshull, provision dealer, of Old Road, Heaton Norris. The prisoner, who seemed to feel her position very keenly, was defended by Mr G. L. Vaughan.—Mary Jane Minshull, wife of the prosecutor, said that on Friday last the prisoner was cleaning for her at her house. Upstairs there was £20 in gold in a box which was on the floor, and the prisoner was upstairs cleaning. During the afternoon, when witness went upstairs for some money, the prisoner left the house, and afterwards she missed a sovereign and a half-sovereign from the purse in the box where the £20 were. Nobody had been upstairs during the day, excepting the prisoner, and her husband. When she missed the money she found a watch glass broken, and about an hour before she missed the money she heard some glass break. Referring to this subsequently, when the prisoner came down, she asked her what glass was broken. The prisoner replied "I don't know that any has broken." In a few minutes after witness missed the money the prisoner came back, and she said "Mary, there's 30s gone out of this purse from the box upstairs, and there's been no one in the room but you and me, and the master to put a collar on." The prisoner thereupon said that Mr Minshull had not gone near the box. Witness then said "This is the glass I heard break (showing some bits of glass,) and you must have either dropped the purse on it or lifted it up with the purse and let it drop again." To that the prisoner made no reply, and witness gave information to the police.—In answer to Mr Vaughan witness said the prisoner offered to be searched when she came back to the house, and also that no money had been traced to the prisoner. She thought at first her husband might have taken the money, but he did not usually take money out of the box without telling her.—Mr Minshull deposed that he went upstairs into the room where the money was on Friday to put a collar on, but did not take or touch the £20.—P.C. Whittaker spoke to apprehending the prisoner. He charged her with stealing 30s from Mr Minshull's, and she replied "I have been cleaning there, but never touched the money."—In reply to Mr Vaughan, the constable said the prisoner had been to him before she was apprehended, saying she was wrongfully accused of stealing 30s.—Mr Vaughan, addressing the Bench for the prisoner, said she was a very respectable charwoman, and she was a most unlikely person to steal. If she had been an experienced thief she would not have contented herself with taking a sovereign and a half simply from amongst 20 sovereigns. It was most improbable that would have been done by anyone who intended to commit a robbery. Moreover, if the prisoner had stolen the money it was not at all likely, when taken to task with it, that she would say "Oh no, Mr Minshull never went near the box." Her conduct had in no way resembled that of a thief, and he submitted that the case amounted to nothing more than suspicion on the part of Mrs Minshull.—The Bench intimated that they thought the case was one which ought to be investigated by a jury, and committed the prisoner for trial to the Salford Sessions. They, however, liberated the prisoner on bail, herself in £20, and two sureties of £10 each.

WEDNESDAY.

Before the MAYOR, J. WALTHEW, JAMES LEIGH, and J. L. VAUGHAN, Esqrs.

ARREARS OF BASTARDY.—David Forrest, packer, Wainwright-street, Oldham Road, Manchester, had been summoned for being £2 6s 6d in arrears of an order of bastardy.—Lucy Ratcliffe, the complainant, said she had seen him on Saturday, and he said he had been slack of work.—The defendant did not appear, and the case was adjourned for a month, to give him an opportunity to pay.

DISTURBERS OF THE PEACE.—George Partington, labourer, 22, Higher Hillgate, and Benjamin Miller, trimmer, also of 22, Higher Hillgate, were charged in custody with creating a noise and disturbance in Simister's Place, on the 16th inst. They were each bound over to keep the peace.—Mary Welsh, for creating a disturbance in Carr Green, was ordered to pay costs.—Andrew Price and Julius Carson, for creating a disturbance of the peace by fighting with each other in Hart-street, on the 14th inst., were both ordered to pay costs.—John Greeney, for committing a breach of the peace in the Underbank, on the 14th inst., was bound over to keep the peace for three months, himself in £10, and two sureties of £5 each.

AN ATTEMPT TO EXTORT MONEY BY MENACES.—John Fallon, piecer, 1, Hobson's Court, John Finley, 46, Swan-street, Thomas Flint, piecer, 16, Princess-street, and John Lingard, 40, Nelson-street, four rough-looking youths, were charged in custody with attempting to extort money by menaces, at Brinnington, on the 17th inst.—John Biggar, hair dresser, Bridge-street Brow, said on Tuesday night he was coming round the "cut" in Brinnington, in company with a young lady, when one of the prisoners came up to him and said "If you don't give us a bob we'll throw you into the 'cut.'" In reply witness said "What do you mean? Wait while I get to Brigham's." Flint said "You will be thrown into the 'cut' before you get to Brigham's." Witness avoided them and went under the railway bridge. The four prisoners ran to the top of the street, and he heard one of them say he (meaning witness) would get it if he went there. He then saw P.C. Parratt, and pointed the prisoners out to him, when they ran away. Witness and the officer ran after them, and he caught one of them. One of the prisoners (Flint) said "If you don't give us a bob, we'll put you into the 'cut.'" Fallon was very quiet, but Flint kept persisting in getting the others back when they were going away. Brigham's was a farm house down in the fields.—Cross-examined by Finley: You was one of the four, and taking part in the menaces.—By Flint: When you came up you said you had seen me and wanted a bob.—Hannah Maria Redfern said said she was in company with the last witness. One of the prisoners came up and said Biggar must either give them a bob or they would kick his brains out. They used very bad language, and followed witness and Biggar down to the bridge. Biggar said he would go to Brigham's, and then Flint caught hold of her dress, and pulled her back. Lingard also said he would not let them go. It was about 10 o'clock. She noticed four young men there, and Lingard and Flint in particular.—P.C. Parratt saw four youths running across the street, and from what Biggar said to him, he knew Flint when he apprehended him as one of the lads who ran across the street. They ran after the prisoners and Biggar caught Fallon, and he afterwards apprehended the other prisoners. He charged them with the offence that morning. Fallon and Finley said "We never spoke to him." The other two made no reply.—Flint was further charged with assaulting Hannah Maria Redfern, on the same occasion, by attempting to prevent her going away. —Biggar corroborated.—In reply to the Magistrates, Finley said he never went near them, nor did he speak to either of them. The other three had nothing to say.—The Mayor said the prisoners had had a very narrow escape of being sent to Chester Assizes. It was a serious thing to demand money from people in that way. If they had succeeded in getting money by those means they would have been sent to the assizes. On the present charge, however, they would be liberated with a caution. Flint, for the assault on the female, would have to go to Knutsford for one month with hard labour.

PLAYING AT PITCH AND TOSS.—Eight lads whose ages ranged from about 14 to 16 years, were charged with being guilty of the above offence in the Ash Fields on Sunday afternoon. Police-constables Albiston and Walton proved the charge. They were watching the defendants through a hedge for about a quarter of an hour.—The Mayor said the defendants had rendered themselves liable to a fine of 5s and costs; but as this was their first appearance they would only be fined 2s 6d and costs each or seven days.

A HARD CASE.—Kyren Power, grinder, a respectably dressed young man, was charged in custody with neglecting his wife and family at Stockport on the 22nd June.—Prisoner pleaded that his wife left him.—Mr Billingham said the wife came to him and stated that her husband had gone away with another woman. He relieved her in the first instance and afterwards admitted her into the Workhouse, where she had since died. £3 5s 6d was the sum which the prisoner's family had received from the Union. When the wife died she left two children.—The prisoner said they had been married six years, and during the whole of that time he had given his wife £1 a week. Eventually, however, he frequently found her out contracting debts behind his back, and having dealings with Scotchmen. He could not trust her any more with his wages, and he often found her drunk. He then began to take care of the money himself, but he soon found her out taking things from the house in order to get drink. If he spoke to her she got into a passion, and raised the whole neighbourhood. She left, and he provided her with a bed; but she afterwards took away the mattresses and the bedstead. She also taunted him with things of which he was not guilty, and, thinking he might as well have the game as the name, he did go away with another woman. That he did not deny. His wife followed him to Burnley, and got him discharged from his situation. He did not leave his family, he was driven from a home which had been made into a hell. He had no objection to pay the money if the magistrates would give him time. He would take the children at once. (The young man was suffering from great emotion whilst making this statement.)—The warrant was suspended for six months to give Power an opportunity of paying the money.

SCHOOL BOARD CASES.—James Pickering and Sabina Carter were summoned for neglecting to send their children to school regularly. Mrs Carter pleaded inability to pay the fees, and the cases were ultimately adjourned for a month to allow of full attendances.—Alfred Bagshaw, whose wife appeared, had been summoned for a similar offence with regard to his girl Margaret. Mr Smethurst said this was a case in which the age of the child was in dispute, and he applied that the child might be produced. He had seen the child, and to his idea it was six or seven years of age. When he sent the officers to enquire Mrs Bagshaw refused to give any information about it. Mrs Bagshawe said the child was not five years of age, and the case was adjourned until Saturday to allow her to produce evidence to that effect.—Summonses against Mrs Fitzpatrick, Mrs Scott, John Lawley, Wm. Haraison, John Hughes, Anthony Toole, and James Brickell, were adjourned for a month to allow of full attendances.—Jas. Ford, whose boy, William, was not at School on the 11th September, was fined 5s.

OBSTRUCTIVES.—Ellen Flanagan, spinner, Duke-street, and Sarah Ann Snee, 17, Back Duke-street, both pleaded guilty to obstructing the footpath in Chestergate on the 24th June, and were each fined 2s 6d and costs or seven days.—Two young females, named Cane and Duffy, for causing an obstruction in Wellington-street, by loitering, were fined 2s 6d and costs or seven days.—Alexander Sheppard, Wm. Marsh, John Robinson, and Peter Adshead, four lads, were charged with causing an obstruction in Ashton's Court, Old Road, on Sunday night, but were discharged with a caution.—Catherine Hill was charged with causing an obstruction in Back Duke-street, by allowing her clothes line to remain there, on the 12th inst. It appeared that defendant had lived there for two years and had been in the habit of hanging her clothes there all the time, and as the case had been taken as a warning to others, the defendant was discharged with a caution.

THE DRUNKEN LIST.—Catherine Duffy, housewife, Longton, Staffordshire, for being drunk and riotous in Howard-street, Chestergate, was fined 5s and costs or seven days.—Roger Burns pleaded guilty to being drunk and riotous in Water-street, on the 7th inst., and also with committing a breach of the peace on the same day. The latter charge was preferred by a young woman named Mary Finn; and this being the prisoner's 19th appearance, he was ordered to pay costs for the breach of the peace, and for the other offence was fined 5s and costs, or seven days.—Ann Davies, for being drunk and riotous in Newbridge Lane on the 15th inst., was fined 5s and costs, or seven days. —Bridget Rooney was mulcted in a similar penalty for being drunk and riotous in Duke-street, on the 14th inst.—Michael Green, for being drunk and riotous in Cook's Court, was ordered to pay 5s and costs, or seven days.

FLORILINE!—FOR THE TEETH AND BREATH.—A few drops of the liquid "Floriline" sprinkled on a wet tooth-brush produces a pleasant lather, which thoroughly cleanses the teeth from all parasites or impurities, hardens the gums, prevents tartar, stops decay, gives to the teeth a peculiar pearly-whiteness, and a delightful fragrance to the breath. It removes all unpleasant odour arising from decayed teeth or tobacco smoke. "The Fragrant Floriline," being composed in part of honey and sweet herbs, is delicious to the taste, and the greatest toilet discovery of the age. Price 2s 6d, of all chemists and perfumers. Prepared by HENRY C. GALLUP, 493, Oxford-street, London.

TO DISGUISE ITS INFERIOR QUALITY.—Consumers have now quite settled in their minds, that the only reason the Chinese have for painting Tea with Prussian Blue and Black Lead, is to disguise the worthless brown leaves, and so pass them off as best tea; the purchaser aware of his or her responsibility, carefully selects Tea that is guaranteed by the Importers to be pure and unsophisticated; and the substantial nutritive properties of Horniman's Pure Tea, in packets, being so well known, thousands of persons daily enjoy the advantages of a rich and delicious beverage, not elsewhere obtainable. See list of agents for this District, printed in this paper.

Image © Reach PLC. Image created courtesy of THE BRITISH LIBRARY BOARD.