

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

VOL. VII.—No. 71. PUBLISHED MONTHLY.
REGISTERED FOR TRANSMISSION ABROAD.

JANUARY 1, 1876.

PRICE ONE PENNY.
By Post THREE HALFPENCE.

THE meeting of Parliament is fixed for February the 8th, and the New Year's message with which we would greet our friends and subscribers is an earnest exhortation to prepare for a vigorous campaign in support of Mr. FORSYTH'S Bill. All political associations are busy preparing for the coming session, and if we would hold the ground we have won, we must not be behind the best of them in serious preparation and earnest work in support of the efforts which our Parliamentary leaders make on our behalf. Petition, petition, petition, must still be the burden of our cry; and we ask all who can aid in this essential manner to send at once to the office of this *Journal*, when they will be supplied with all necessary material and information.

The last month of the year that has just closed has been marked by a signal step in the political progress of the question. The National Reform Union Conference recently held at Manchester, which represents the advanced section of the Liberal party, has formally recognised the principle of the right of women citizens to vote in the election of Members of Parliament. In the original draft of resolutions prepared by the committee to be submitted to the Conference, the principle, though recognised, was not quite unmistakably promulgated. The principle the Conference was asked to adopt was "the equality of all citizens before the law," and this was understood to include women citizens. But, when definite resolutions came to be proposed, the scope of this declaration was made clear. The resolution respecting the reform of the representative system recommended as a subject for immediate legislation "the extension of household suffrage to counties." Miss STURGE, who appeared at the Conference as a delegate from the Women's Liberal Association of Birmingham, moved as an amendment the extension of the suffrage to *all* householders in counties, with the intention of including women householders, and in this sense the amendment was carried by an overwhelming majority, and afterwards unanimously adopted as a substantive resolution.

The significance of this resolution may be estimated from the fact that the Conference consisted of several

hundred delegates representing 173 Liberal Associations in 128 towns, and that this great representative body found it impossible to resist the logic of the claim of women citizens, householders, and ratepayers, for the electoral privileges which the household and ratepayer's qualification confers on men. The Women's Suffrage Associations, as such were, of course, not represented at the Conference. They exist for the sole object of obtaining for women who are otherwise legally qualified, the right of voting in the election of Members of Parliament. Their platform is not a party one, and they could not appear at any gathering convened for party purposes. But though the Women's Suffrage Societies are of no party, their principle is one which commends itself to both parties. It recognises the necessity for the further enfranchisement of the people, and is therefore Liberal. But it seeks this extension of enfranchisement strictly on the ancient lines of the Constitution, and is therefore Conservative.

In the evening, after the Reform Union Conference, a public meeting was held in the Free Trade Hall, under the presidency of Mr. JACOB BRIGHT, when resolutions were passed approving of the proceedings of the Conference, and accepting them as the basis of future action. In proposing the first resolution, Mr. W. S. CAINE pointed out the amendment introduced by Miss STURGE, and explained that it committed the meeting to the principle of giving votes to all householders, both male and female, adding that he was glad the Conference had adopted the resolution as amended, unanimously. Afterwards, in supporting a vote of thanks to the Chairman, Miss STURGE explained that the same principle had been adopted three years ago by the Reform Association of Birmingham, on a resolution proposed by Mr. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN, now their worthy Mayor. Mr. JACOB BRIGHT, in responding to the vote of thanks, said that if he were in the House of Commons again he would give his attention to the weakest in the community, whether the agricultural labourer or those who had been so ably represented by Miss STURGE that evening. If he was in the position at all of a representative of these, he gloried in his clients; they did not do him any disgrace. If they should come

to have a real household suffrage, they would make it far more easy for a Member of Parliament to attend to his duties, because they always understood the question in which those were interested who had votes, but they never understood the question in which those were interested who had not votes.

It may be taken as a sign of the times, and of the acceptance of the principle of representative government for women by the leaders of both the great parties in the State, that the great Conservative gathering in the Free Trade Hall, which preceded by a few days the Reform Conference in the same building in Manchester, was presided over by a statesman who has unequivocally declared himself in favour of women's suffrage. The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER may be regarded as representing the Conservative party of the future, and he is on our side. In 1873 he addressed a letter to a constituent in Devonshire, in which he said, "I have long been of opinion that women possessing the necessary qualification as ratepayers ought to be admitted to the franchise;" and in the same year Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE voted for Mr. JACOB BRIGHT'S Bill.

Within one fortnight Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE and Mr. JACOB BRIGHT have each presided over great public meetings in the same historic building. The two meetings represent the opposite poles of the dual organism of the politics of the British nation. We need not here refer to the subjects of difference between these two great parties. But we may note with pardonable satisfaction the fact that the principle of women's suffrage is recognised by both. The two Conservative members for Manchester, like the statesman whom they welcomed to this city, have uniformly supported the Women's Disabilities Removal Bill, while the cordial and triumphant reception given to Mr. JACOB BRIGHT, and the unanimity with which the principle which he has done so much to promote was accepted, unmistakably indicate the sentiments of advanced Liberals on the enfranchisement of women.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in his speech at Manchester, said, "Lancashire is the prerogative county of England, and what Lancashire thinks to-day, England will think to-morrow." Already a clear majority of Lancashire members vote for the Women's Suffrage Bill, and if the saying of the CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER be true—as it seems hitherto to have been true when the balance of political power has shifted from one party to the other—much more shall it be true when the principle adopted by the "prerogative county," whose DUCHESS wears the

British Crown, is one which is accepted by men of both parties, and which rests on those foundations of constitutional and national justice which underlie all parties, and which no vicissitudes of political warfare are ever likely to disturb.

IN his recent speech at Manchester, the CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in describing the policy of the Conservative party said, "We have endeavoured, in the first place, to maintain institutions and to improve them, so as to adapt them to the circumstances of the times, rather than to destroy them and create new ones; and, in the second place, we have endeavoured, as far as in us lay, to educate and carry with us the people of this country as to what has to be done with them and through them rather than for them." It is probable that Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE had not women specially in his mind when he made the above observations; yet his words do convey very happily the principles on which we seek the enfranchisement of women. We seek to maintain the institutions which admit women to the exercise of political power, as in the right to inherit the throne, and which admit them to the franchise in local and municipal elections. We seek to improve these institutions so as to adapt them to the circumstances of the time, by admitting women to exercise political power through the machinery of Parliamentary elections, now that such elections have become the main channels through which such power is exerted in modern days.

We seek to educate and carry with us the people of this country—women as well as men—so that the work of legislation and social amelioration shall be done with them and through them, rather than for them; and we are convinced that when the women of the realm shall be no longer an inert mass, to be legislated and thought for by others, but be an intelligent and co-operating force in the government of the nation, the awakening of public spirit and the work of social improvement will proceed at a pace sufficiently accelerated to keep up with the advance of the country in mechanical and material improvement, a race in which it is at present so lamentably in the rear.

ANSWERS to the question "Is the QUEEN a politician?" are continually arising to refute the disloyal assertions of those who would deny the facts of past and contemporary history in order to support the theory of the political incapacity of women. One of the latest answers was given by the Earl of ROSEBERY, in presiding at the

anniversary festival of the Scottish Corporation. In proposing the first toast, the health of the QUEEN, the noble chairman said, "Whatever individual theories about Monarchy may be, I have never heard it disputed that the QUEEN, by an impartiality rare in the traditions of the Throne, by a private life against which no whisper has ever been breathed—(cheers)—and, above all, by a heart thoroughly British in its sympathies and womanly in its warmth, has enabled this country to remain at peace with itself, when other nations were divided, has conciliated to herself the affections of all parts of her Empire, and has conducted the affairs of this country through revolutions which have ruined other Empires and desolated the whole Continent of Europe."

THE great meeting at Huddersfield occurred so near the end of November that we were unable to give a full report of all the speeches, or an adequate notice of it, in our last issue. The MAYOR, in opening the proceedings, having stated how he came to preside over the meeting, said that he owed something to the ladies, for it was to the votes of women that he owed his re-election as a member of the Town Council in 1871. Alderman WOODHEAD declared his hearty sympathy with the movement, as did also Councillor MARRIOTT. Miss LILLIAS ASHWORTH said that it was evident that in dealing with this question the hon. member for Huddersfield had "allowed his reason to repose," quoting from his speech in the House of Commons. There was one apparently real objection he had urged against the Bill, for he said it was contrary to immemorial usage, and the custom of mankind, and he took his stand by the Doxology, "as it was in the beginning is now and ever shall be." But women from time immemorial had possessed some share of political power in this country. There was nothing in the ancient law to prevent a freeholder or householder, merely by reason of sex, from taking part in an election, if properly qualified. A judge had used these words, "I see no disability in a woman from voting for a Parliament man." Thus they were supported in their demand by the ancient usages of their country.

Mrs. OLIVER SCATCERD said that members of Parliament often asked them to look at Miss FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE and one or two of her friends, and imitate them; but why did they not tell the agricultural labourer to look at Mr. JOHN BRIGHT or Mr. FORSTER, and imitate them. Genius would under some circumstances rise and make itself known, but she had yet to learn that genius was

spread broadcast among men more than among women. She would remark that Miss NIGHTINGALE, Miss OCTAVIA HILL, Miss COBBE, and Miss CARPENTER all wanted the Women's Suffrage Bill, but this Bill was intended for the average women of all classes.

Miss BEEDY said that Mr. LEATHAM had declared that nature had denied to women the faculty of close reasoning, but had given them an innate and unreasoning sense of what is womanly, and this sense rebelled against the principle of the Bill. She asked what this unreasoning sense of what was womanly really was. They were in the habit of considering that womanly which they were in the habit of seeing women do, and they were in the habit of considering that unwomanly which they were not in the habit of seeing them do. With reference to Miss NIGHTINGALE going to the Crimea, there was at first a general sentiment that her course was unwomanly, but the moral sense of the country was not slow to appreciate the services she rendered there, and this moral sense triumphed over the unreasoning sense of the unwomanly.

Miss BECKER said that they had been blamed because in asking for the franchise for women they had not asked for a reconstruction of the basis on which the franchise was given, and because they asked it only for women who already voted in local elections. They were taunted with this, but this taunt could not drive them from their strong position within the ancient lines of the constitution to a weaker one outside those lines. If the capacity to maintain a household was a test of political fitness, it was a better test for women than for men, because the difficulties which women had to encounter in maintaining themselves respectably, and in keeping a house over their heads, were greater than those of men. Mr. LEATHAM had said that the political fitness of men, as a class, was not doubted; but the political fitness of women, as a class, was doubted. Women had, however, exhibited a political capacity equal with that of men. Queens and princesses were just as good rulers as kings and princes in the history of Europe; and in India, at the present day, women rulers showed considerably more political capacity than men in the states they had respectively to govern. The political capacity of negroes, as a class, was doubted; nevertheless, it was found necessary for the protection of their personal rights to invest them with the franchise. In giving negroes votes, they need not expect that a negro would be elected President of the United States. Another objection was that women were not sufficiently educated for the franchise. If that were true, where did the fault lie? All the funds

and all the direction of the education of the country had been in the hands of men, and, if they had neglected to educate women, they had now no right to turn round and allege the injury caused by this neglect as an excuse for depriving women of political rights.

Miss STURGE said that the most crushing thing which fell upon them was not logic, but woman's sphere. Woman's sphere was a kind of extinguisher—very pleasant for those who were outside of it, but not so pleasant to those who were under it. An Englishman was apt to think a woman was out of her sphere if her voice was heard in public; a Turk thought she was out of her sphere if her face was seen in public. Was there much logical difference between these two opinions? She thought there was a little delusion as to what was and should be woman's sphere; she was very much inclined to think that half of what they had been accustomed to consider as womanly was moral cowardice. She noticed in Mr. FORSTER's speech about education at Bradford, he said he recollected that some women came over to the Anti-Slavery Conference and wanted to speak. The gentlemen, as some gentlemen were now, were afraid of the women, and did not wish to hear them speak. Mr. FORSTER asked one lady why she came, and she replied, "This is a conference of persons interested in the suppression of the slave trade; am I not a person?" It was just their position about women's suffrage. She did not object to being disfranchised, if she were not a ratepayer; but she did object to being disfranchised for being a woman.

In a speech made at Huddersfield a day or two after the meeting, Mr. LEATHAM complained that not one of the arguments on which he had been accustomed to rely in dealing with this question had been so much as touched by one of the speakers. This declaration was on the face of it premature, because the honourable gentleman was not present at the meeting, and the reports of all the speeches had not been published. These do contain a careful examination of most of his principal assertions. He said there was nothing in reference to Revelation except a sneer at it. In reply to this we indignantly deny that there was any "sneer" at Revelation in any one of the ladies' speeches. The advocates of women's suffrage do not sneer at what is held sacred, nor descend to misrepresentations and personalities respecting those who differ from them. They leave such weapons to their adversaries.

Mr. LEATHAM complains that his "argument" from Revelation has been left untouched. But before it can be

touched he must be good enough to produce it. We have seen no "argument" of his drawn from this source. He has certainly declared that "the experience of ages, sanctioned by Revelation, has assigned a distinct sphere to man and woman;" but if this position be admitted it remains to be proved whether the function of voting in the election of members of Parliament does or does not lie out of the sphere of the interests or capacities of women. Mr. LEATHAM would doubtless settle the matter summarily by a simple declaration that it does; but we do not know by what authority he assumes the function of a Pope on questions affecting his fellow-subjects. We are not aware that any Council has invested him with the attribute of infallibility when he speaks *ex cathedra* on questions of political faith and morals; and even if he could produce such credentials, we fear there might be found some obstinate Protestants among women who would refuse to resign the right of private judgment on a question which primarily concerns themselves.

But in truth it is an anachronism to introduce arguments from Revelation into modern political discussion. This was not so in the days of the STUARTS, when the upholders of the Divine Right of Kings brought a powerful array of texts and a long chain of arguments drawn from immemorial usage and the experience of ages in support of their theory of the wickedness, under any circumstances, of rebellion against the LORD'S Anointed. They had a much stronger case than any which Mr. LEATHAM can make out for the perpetual subjection of women to the irresponsible government of men. Opinions among Englishmen may yet be divided as to the merits of the Great Rebellion. But we venture to assert that no body of persons whose opinions command public respect at the present day appeal to Revelation to judge between CHARLES I. and his Parliament.

It is now generally admitted that Revelation was not meant to teach practical politics any more than it was meant to teach physical science. The experience of ages, sanctioned by Revelation, once taught men to believe that the sun revolved round the earth. But modern science has reversed the teaching of old experience, and men have given a new reading to Revelation. All propositions deduced from Revelation resolve themselves into questions of interpretation—and who shall pretend to declare that on any one point the final stage has been arrived at? Men do not now look to Revelation when they desire to determine the relations between the earth and the sun, the age of our planet, or even the antiquity

of man. Neither do modern politicians appeal to that authority when they are considering the questions of the enfranchisement of the agricultural labourer, equal electoral districts, or even the Disestablishment of the Church. Why then should men appeal to Revelation on the question of enfranchising women householders? In spite of verbal difficulties, the belief in Revelation has survived the acceptance of the doctrines of modern science, and of the principle of the freedom and independence of men from arbitrary and external authority. In like manner it will remain unaffected by the recognition of the doctrine which is indeed one of the peculiar glories of Christianity—the equality, in all essential points, of woman with man.

Sir CHARLES LYELL once said that a scientific discovery had to pass through three stages in the popular mind; the first, that it was not true, the second, that it was contrary to religion, the third, that everyone knew it before. These three stages, like the Stone, Bronze, and Iron Ages of primitive man, may be going on contemporaneously in different tribes in various portions of the earth's surface. It is evident that in the mind of the honourable member for Huddersfield the question of women's suffrage has arrived at the second stage, and this might afford grounds for the prognostication that in due season it may attain the third.

SPEECHES OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT.

MR. C. W. NEVILL, M.P., AT LLANELLY.

On November 19th, Mr. Nevill, member for the boroughs of Carmarthen and Llanely, addressed his constituents at the Athenæum Hall, Llanely. The hon. gentleman, in speaking of the Bills introduced in the last session of Parliament, said he would class them in three classes, first those measures that were intended for the alteration or improvement of the constitution or form of government which he called political. In this class there were three measures only which were of considerable importance. After referring to the Peace Preservation (Ireland) Bill, he said the other two measures in the class were Mr. Forsyth's Bill for extending the suffrage to women, and Mr. Trevelyan's Bill for extending household suffrage to counties. He did not see his way clear to extend the suffrage to all women, and could not yet believe such an extension was possible. He had voted against the admission of women to the medical schools, but as regards Mr. Forsyth's Bill, he was prepared to vote in favour of it because it extended the suffrage only in the same way that it is now enjoyed, he thought in the elections of school boards, namely, by those who held the same qualifications as was required of men, and that could only be held by widows and unmarried women. He did not happen to vote for Mr. Forsyth's Bill, because he was in the country, and he could not, without great difficulty, attend in his place, otherwise he would have voted in favour of it.

THE HON. J. C. DUNDAS, M.P., AT RICHMOND.

Questions having been invited, Mr. Dundas, in replying to Mr. Huxwell, stated that he had, two years ago, declared that so long as the franchise depended upon the property qualification, he saw no objection to allowing to lady householders a right to vote in a Parliamentary election, as they now did at a municipal election. If the Bill was brought forward again he would certainly vote for it, although he would not vote for allowing ladies to become candidates for Parliamentary honours. (Cheers and laughter.) On the motion of Dr. Carter, a vote of confidence was unanimously passed to Mr. Dundas, and the proceedings terminated.

MR. M'LAREN, M.P., AT EDINBURGH.

The members for Edinburgh addressed their constituents on December 3rd. In the course of his address Mr. M'Laren said, "I voted for the Woman's Suffrage Bill, because it was just in itself, although I believed it would strengthen the Tory party rather than the Liberals. This opinion, has, however, undergone a change from the speech of a lady friend of mine, Miss Ashworth, of Bath, at Huddersfield, a few days since, in answer to the objections of the member for that borough. Miss Ashworth showed that in the English boroughs at the election of councillors during the last two years the Liberals had gained largely, while, as I have shown you, at the Parliamentary election the Tories gained largely. Lord Hartington noticed the same fact in his Bristol speech, but did not attempt to account for it. In Manchester, for example, the Tories carried two members out of the three at the last election of members of Parliament; but in the municipal elections the Liberals carried two out of every three returned at the last election. (Applause.) Miss Ashworth, in accounting for this, urged, with great force, that these different results could only have arisen from one cause—that the names of women householders having been placed on the burgess roll, they voted in the election of town councillors, but not being on the Parliamentary register they were prevented from voting in the election of members of Parliament. It remains for those who can discover a better reason to bring it forward before the public."

THE NATIONAL REFORM UNION.

CONFERENCE IN MANCHESTER.

A conference of members and friends of the National Reform Union was held in the Free Trade Hall, Manchester, on December 15th. The delegates appointed by the various Liberal Associations to attend the proceedings numbered some hundreds, and represented 173 associations in 128 towns. Mr. J. Slagg, chairman of the executive committee, presided. Among the subjects of discussion was the Extension of the Suffrage and Redistribution of Seats.

Hon. E. LYULPH STANLEY moved—"That this conference is of opinion that the National Reform Union should continue to agitate in favour of the reform of the representative system, by the extension of household suffrage to the counties and the equalisation of electoral power."

The resolution was supported by various speakers, and amendments were proposed, all of which, save one, were rejected. The successful amendment was moved by Miss Sturge, who, with Mrs. Ashford, appeared as a delegate from the Women's Liberal Association, Birmingham.

Miss STURGE, (who spoke from a form in the area of the hall, said she wished clearly to know whether the words of the resolution were understood to include women householders. ("Hear, hear," laughter, and cheers.) Whether she as a delegate would

be able to vote for the resolution depended upon the reply to that question. If she did not get an answer to the question she would move an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the meeting will understand that the motion before us embraces exactly what it says, and anything that is not excluded from it is a matter for subsequent discussion and subsequent determination. It is quite impossible within the scope of these deliberations to include everything that the Liberal party may have to consider. We are met to determine those points on which we have the largest amount of agreement, otherwise, I think it will be impossible to proceed at all. I can assure Miss Sturge that at any rate her idea of the subject of household suffrage is clearly not excluded by the words of the resolution.

Miss STURGE: I move that for the words, "to the counties," the words "to all householders" be substituted.

The Rev. LLOYD JONES (Warrington) seconded the amendment, which was submitted to the meeting and carried by a large majority.

The announcement was received with much applause, and a call for three cheers for Miss Sturge was heartily responded to.—A Delegate complaining that the amendment had not been thoroughly understood, the CHAIRMAN put the resolution and amendment substantively, as follows:—"That this Conference is of opinion that the National Reform Union should continue to agitate in favour of the reform of the representative system by the extension of household suffrage to all householders in counties and the equalisation of electoral power." This was also carried by a great majority.

A subsequent amendment to adopt manhood suffrage as a subject for immediate agitation was defeated by an overwhelming majority, only the mover and seconder voting for it.

THE PUBLIC MEETING.

In the evening a public meeting, under the presidency of Mr. Jacob Bright, was held in the Free Trade Hall.

The first resolution was moved by Mr. W. S. CAINE, of Liverpool. It pledged the meeting to "concentrate their energies in furtherance of those principles and objects which have been adopted as the basis of the future operations of the National Reform Union." In the course of his address Mr. Caine said he was glad that Miss Sturge had very cleverly introduced in three words which she inserted in that resolution, the principle of granting the vote to all householders, both male and female—(hear, and cheers)—and he was glad that the conference had adopted the resolution, as amended, unanimously.

After the conclusion of the proceedings in support of the resolution, a vote of thanks to Mr. Jacob Bright for presiding was moved by Mr. C. H. HOPWOOD, M.P., and supported by Mr. JOHN MORLEY, and Mr. H. F. BLAIR.

Miss STURGE, of Birmingham, said that it was with a strong fellow-feeling that she was with them that night. It was because she felt that she represented to some extent the women of England—(cheers)—the women of England whose sympathies would be with them more largely still if they did not treat them too Conservatively. (Laughter.) It was an old saying and a true one that "as they sowed, so they must reap." Mr. Jacob Bright had done much to endear the cause of Liberalism to the women of England. (Cheers.) The National Reform Union had added that day to that debt of gratitude. She was proud to say that the Reform Association of her native town three years ago adopted the same principle by a resolution moved by Mr. Joseph Chamberlain—now their worthy mayor. (Cheers.) Their Reform Association had failed

to carry it. It was an unsettled question, and she stood before them, like Mr. Joseph Arch, one of a highly deserving, yet, unfranchised class. (Laughter, and renewed cheering.) Trust women with political power, and she could assure them they would become trustworthy. Distrust them, and what could they expect? Lord Hartington remarked the other day that whereas the Parliamentary elections had gone in a Conservative manner, they would find that generally—especially of late—the municipal elections had gone in favour of the Liberals. (Hear, hear.) He asked them to remark that in the Parliamentary elections women had no part; in the municipal elections they had. (Laughter and cheers.) There was to-day a stronger feeling in favour of religious equality, which most of necessity include women. By priestcraft she understood that profane assumption whereby one mortal would presume to step between another mortal and his or her God. So long as men assumed that they knew better than women what was right than women knew for themselves, we must have priestcraft. (Laughter and cheers.) She did not ask that women should be a law unto men any more than men unto women. She longed that they might both seek after a higher law, and in that unity of purpose there would be a better, a truer, a holier, harmony, than any we at present enjoyed. (Cheers.)

The resolution having been passed with acclamation,

Mr. JACOB BRIGHT, in acknowledging the compliment, said that when he was sent by Manchester to the House of Commons he went there in the hope of performing the simple duty of looking after the wellbeing and the wants of the people; and whatever course he might have taken in Parliament, he could say with the utmost sincerity that he had only had the one desire—to give the utmost possible protection to those everywhere who most required help. ("Hear, hear," and cheers.) With regard to his possible position in the future, he did not ask to represent any place, but if Manchester or any other constituency believed that he could fairly and thoroughly represent it, then he should be proud to accept its invitation. (Cheers.) He cared only to sit in Parliament in order that he might have more influence in forwarding certain views which he believed to be of advantage to the country, but he could work as well outside as any man. He had no apology to make that evening. If he were in the House of Commons again he would give his attention to the weakest in the community; whether the agricultural labourer or those who had been so ably and admirably represented by Miss Sturge that evening. A man need not be ashamed of that. If he was in the position at all of a representative of these he gloried in his clients; they did not do him any disgrace. If they should come to have a real household suffrage they would make it far more easy for members of Parliament to attend to their duties, because they always understood the questions with which those were interested who had votes, but they never understood the question with which those were interested who had not votes. In conclusion, he thanked them for the vote of thanks, and expressed a hope that the step which Manchester was taking, through that organisation, would do something to extend the reign of justice in the land. (Cheers.) The meeting then separated.

THE INTEGRITY OF THE FRANCHISE.—A certain society is said to have been formed for the purpose of "preserving the integrity of the franchise," and this integrity is to be preserved by excluding the claims of women. To have integrity of nature is to have that nature untouched—(in-tango)—unimpaired, and therefore complete; but if a thing is not complete, you do not, by keeping it as it is, preserve its integrity, you simply preserve its incompleteness. C. H. C.

PUBLIC MEETINGS.

KING'S LYNN.

On December 6th, a meeting was held in the Music Hall, Athenæum, Lynn. The chair was taken by J. D. Thew, Esq., and on the platform were Miss Becker, Miss Beedy, M.A., Dr. J. Lowe, Revs. J. Rollo and D. Amos, Messrs. W. Monement, H. B. Plowright, R. H. Household, J. J. Coulton, R. B. Household, C. B. Plowright, W. L. Armes, B. T. Birch, A. P. Allen, H. K. Roberts, A. Jermyn, J. W. Barrett, J. Nurse, and a number of ladies. The Chairman, in opening the proceedings, said that some might feel surprised that he, as a Conservative, was there to advocate a further extension of the suffrage, and might think that, as a party, the Conservatives were going to take another "leap in the dark," but he did not look upon this as a party question. It was supported by eminent men of both political sections, and opposed by others, he would not say equally eminent men. Mr. Leatham had entered the lists against the movement, and in his (the chairman's) opinion had come out second best. The first resolution was proposed by Dr. Lowe, seconded by Mr. Coulton, supported by Miss Becker, and carried unanimously. A resolution adopting petitions was proposed by Mr. Household, supported by Mr. Allen and Miss Beedy, and was carried.

LINCOLN.

A meeting to consider the question of extending the Parliamentary suffrage to women householders was held in the Masonic Hall on Monday evening, December 13th. The Rev. W. F. Clarkson presided, and there was a good attendance of both sexes. The meeting was addressed by Miss Becker and Miss Beedy. Mr. Alderman Maltby, the Rev. E. Compton, the Rev. C. Stovell, and the Rev. Mr. Metcalfe took part in the proceedings. The usual resolutions were adopted.

KNARESBOROUGH.

A meeting was held on Tuesday, December 14th, in the Town Hall, Knareborough. R. Gill, Esq., presided, and the lady speakers were supported on the platform by C. Kirby, Esq., and W. Gelder, Esq. A large number of ladies were present, and soon after the meeting had fairly commenced the hall was comfortably filled.—The Chairman, in opening the proceedings, said they could point in their own immediate district to the labours of ladies, who had worked throughout their lives for the benefit of others. He referred to the late Mrs. Stephens and Miss Stephens.—After Mrs. Scatcherd and Miss Beedy had addressed the meeting, the usual resolutions were put and carried with but one dissident.—Mr. W. Gelder proposed and Dr. Beaumont seconded a motion proposing the adoption of petitions, which was adopted unanimously.—A vote of thanks, proposed by Mr. Hannam, to the chairman, closed the proceedings.

MALTON.

A meeting was held on December 17th, in the Assembly Rooms, Malton, Yorkshire. The Hon. C. W. Wentworth Fitzwilliam, M.P. for the borough, occupied the chair. In opening the proceedings, the chairman said he must not be supposed to commit himself to the principles of the measure, but he would give the subject most careful consideration. Miss Beedy and Miss Becker appeared as a deputation on behalf of the society, and the usual resolutions were put and carried by a large majority.

PUDSEY.

On December 1st, a lecture was delivered by Mrs. Oliver Scatcherd in the Baptist Schoolroom, under the auspices of the Stanningley Reform Club. The Rev. J. Bevan, of Pudsey, presided. The lecture was listened to with great attention, and the usual complimentary votes were passed.

SPEECHES OF MISS BEEDY AND MISS STURGE AT HUDDERSFIELD.

Owing to the exigencies of time and space, we were unable last month to give full reports of the speeches of these two ladies at the Huddersfield meeting, we therefore present them now.

Miss BEEDY, M.A., said she thought there were very few who denied the abstract justice on the part of taxpaying women having a voice in selecting men who were to expend the public funds. She found very few, too, who did not say, "There is no logic in allowing these women to vote for town councillors, and in refusing to allow them to vote for members of Parliament." They were generally told that they were not to consider the question as a matter of abstract right and abstract logic; that they were to consider it in its practical aspects; they were to consider what its effect would be upon the social position of women, and upon the general tone of society. And it was upon these aspects of the question she wished to speak. There was no one who was familiar with the actual state of the law who would not say that there were many laws which were unjust to women, and that in consequence of this injustice women suffered great hardships. She believed, too, that there was no thoughtful person who would deny that in all matters where the interests of men and women were opposed, it was only natural that men should legislate with a keener eye to their own interests than to the interests of women. Mr. Gladstone once said, in referring to those laws where the interests of men and women were opposed, "It is impossible not to see that the law does much less than justice to women, and that women suffer great hardships through this injustice, and that any man who can devise a plan by which this injustice shall be set right must be considered a great benefactor." The exercise of the Parliamentary franchise on the part of women would tend to remove that injustice in legislation. Again, in matters where the interests of men and women were not opposed—where they might have equal but not altogether united interests—they found that the interests of the men got attended to while the interests of the women were overlooked. To illustrate that she need only refer to the educational condition of this country. There were very few who would not say that it was as important to educate women as to educate men; but as a matter of fact the provision for the education of men was incomparably better than the provision for the education of women. This was not wholly to be charged upon the past, for in the actual working of the School Board at the present time more money was expended per head upon a boy than upon a girl. Men knew by experience their own needs, and they attended to them with vigour. They were less conscious of the needs of women, and the consequence was the interests of women were overlooked. They saw this in the actual working of Parliament. Bills which referred exclusively to the interests of women had a much less chance of getting a hearing than the Bills which concerned the interests of men. And that was not strange. Members were sent to Parliament to represent their constituents—to look after the interests of their constituents, and they looked after those interests. Women were not their constituents, and the interests of women were overlooked, and kept in the background. A very well-known member of the late Parliament once said that, to get the Women's Bill through Parliament was like attempting to move a loaded waggon without horses—there was no motive power to get it forward. What they desired was to make women constituents of members of Parliament, so as to supply that motive power; so as to have some means of pressing upon the attention of members of Parliament those matters which specially concerned the interests of women. In the same way she might show them how the exercise of the Parliamentary

franchise on the part of women would tend to improve their industrial position. As Miss Ashworth had told them, there were one-third of the women in England and Wales who were bread-winners; another had said that four millions of the women in this country earned their own livelihood. They all knew the disadvantages of working women as compared with working men. No one felt that the industrial position of women was as it ought to be, or what it might be. The position of women in all these matters, as compared with men, was very much what the position of the middle classes was as compared with the upper classes before the Reform Bill of '32. The middle classes complained of unjust legislation in matters where their interests were in conflict with the interests of the upper classes; they complained of their inadequate provision for their education; they complained of trammelled industries. The middle class was enfranchised, and all these three difficulties began gradually to be removed. Again, the position of women, as compared with men, was very much what the position of the working classes was as compared with employers of labour before the Reform Bill of 1867. Working men complained of unjust legislation in matters where their interests were opposed to the interests of the capitalists; they complained of the inadequate provision for their education; they complained of the trammels upon their industrial pursuits. The working classes received the franchise and all these three difficulties, they clearly saw, were being removed. Parliament was attending to the education of these classes; it was removing unjust laws; and in many ways the industrial position of working men had been vastly improved from the power they had possessed of assisting in putting men into Parliament, or in keeping men out of Parliament. Now, they said that the position of women in all these important respects—in this matter of just laws, in this matter of education, in this matter of industrial pursuits, would be vastly improved by giving women the power of assisting in putting men into Parliament, or in getting them out of Parliament. (Cheers.) There was a question asked—"How will it affect the general tone of society?" What was it they were asking for these women? Not that they might draft Parliamentary bills—not even that they might vote upon them when they were drafted—they were simply asking for them that they might be allowed to use their influence in saying to what men those duties and responsibilities might be safely entrusted. (Applause.) Did not women know what men were of good repute for intelligence and integrity? Did they not know what men did most to advance the interests of society? and would not these women—this class of unprotected women—use their influence to put such men into positions of trust and power? Any one who considered this question must say that women would, as a rule, select a higher class of men as their representatives in Parliament than men did. (Hear, hear.) Women were greater sufferers than men from disorder and immorality in society, and as a result of this, it was more directly and especially their interest to put men into positions of trust and power who would guard against disorder and immorality. Unprotected women knew that they owed their welfare in society to the best men, and they would use their influence to put such men into positions of responsibility. Within the lines of their party they would be disposed to choose the better class of men, and she was certain this would sometimes be the state of society that they would sometimes be forced to take available men, as men were forced to do; but when these men were once in Parliament, what were the measures that women would press upon their attention? The hon. member for Huddersfield said, "There are many questions before Parliament concerning which women know nothing. Women have no knowledge to

contribute to the army and navy regulations; women know nothing of matters of finance and questions of judicature," and that was very true. Those were men's questions rather than women's questions; they were within the experience of men, but they were also within the experience of a very narrow class of men. (Loud cheers.) It was only the trained men who could give an opinion upon these questions; it was only the trained and experienced men who guided legislation in this department. The great mass of voters entrusted these questions to members of Parliament; members of Parliament entrusted them to their ministers; the ministers entrusted them to the permanent, responsible heads of departments; the great mass of voters had no opinion whatever upon these questions, except in a rare chance case, when a minister or head of department blundered, and did something like the Admiralty circular—(loud cheers)—to offend the moral sense of the community, and then the great class of men voters cried out, and the women cried out with them. (Renewed cheers.) Women's votes would have influenced this question. Fifty years ago these were the leading questions of Parliament; but how was it to-day? These educational questions, these moral and social questions, that come into the front, these temperance questions, these questions regarding the management of criminals, questions relating to sanitary matters, questions immediately and directly affecting the whole body politic, were questions in which men and women were alike interested; and she would venture to say that women had upon those questions opinions which were as trustworthy as those of men. (Loud cheers.) Now, in the matter of education—and here she knew she was on tender ground—the opinions of women were not quite the opinions of men. Women of the Church and women of Dissenting bodies believed more strongly in religious education than men did, and she wanted to explain what they meant by that religious education. Women, knowing how character was developed in children, believed more strongly than men did, that it was not only important to teach children facts, and to teach them how to think, but that they must teach them their duties. Then again in the temperance question she would venture to say that men were not more in favour of temperance than women were. Cardinal Manning, in his late speech at Manchester, said, "Men drink and women suffer," and he touched the key-note of success when he said, "Why don't you consult the opinions of the women upon the temperance question?" (Loud cheers.) Again, Mrs. Scatcherd had referred to a point which interested her (the speaker), and which she should scarcely have referred to but she had brought it up. Women did not hold precisely the same views that men did in regard to the treatment of criminals. She had observed this in her acquaintance with men and women, and she had it forcibly thrust upon her at the great International Prison Congress, held in London three years ago. Men treated criminals as a rule in this way, they attempted to force the evil-doer out of the wrong way, while women attempted to lead the evil-doer into the right way. (Loud cheers.) She wished to say that the moral influence, which it was everywhere conceded that women exerted in their private life and urged upon every Conference—and this measure proposed that they should have the power to press this moral sentiment upon the legislature in Parliament to affect the opinions of men in this matter—was well and truthfully illustrated in the influence of the present reign in this country; in the moral influence that had been thrown into the life of the nation by the Queen. There was one more point to which she wished to refer, and it was in the speech of the hon. and distinguished member for Huddersfield. She knew that they were proud of their representative; that those who listened to his speeches in Parliament had reason to be proud of him, and that the

great Liberal party were proud of him; but here was one sentence to which she wished to draw their attention:—"I should be content," said Mr. Leatham, "to base my opposition to the measure upon the attitude towards it of the very sex for whose benefit it has been sought. The hon. and learned gentleman has admitted that nature has denied to woman the faculty of very close reasoning, but nature has given her another faculty, which, in her circumstances, is perhaps of equal importance, and that is an innate and unreasoning sense of what is womanly; and with all the vehemence of an intuitive perception, that sense rebels and protests against the principle of this Bill." She did not read that to ridicule Mr. Leatham; it represented the general feeling of society. There was a feeling that it was unwomanly for a woman to take part in political life, and men dreaded to have women in whom they were interested exposing themselves to criticism, that any prominent position in this work must expose them to, but let them see what this unreasoning sense of what was womanly really was. They were in the habit of considering that womanly that they were in the habit of seeing women do; they were in the habit of considering that unwomanly that they were not in the habit of seeing them do. Women had not been in the habit of voting for members of Parliament. They had not long been permitted to vote in the election of members of the Town Council; and it was not very strange, therefore, that there was a sense in the community that it was unwomanly for them to do so. Women in the upper classes of this country had always taken an active part in political life; they had been in the habit of canvassing for their husbands—of going through the most difficult work in canvassing for their relatives, or their friends, or their favourite candidate; and, from the fact of that habit, there was a feeling in the country that it was not unwomanly for the women to do that. But let them see the difference. These women went through the most rough and public work, and public sentiment said it was womanly, because they saw them do it. Women in this country had not long been in the habit of going quietly to the ballot box, and depositing their vote; the public was not accustomed to see women doing that, and hence thought that it was unwomanly. She was sure then that Mr. Leatham would agree with her that it was a most unreasoning sense of what was womanly which made that discrimination. (Cheers.) Let them now see how they were going to dispose of what is unwomanly in regard to women voting. She thought she could give a case which was exactly in point. She chanced to know a very estimable and wealthy lady belonging to the Society of Friends, and she had what Mr. Leatham described as a vehement and intuitive perception which rebelled and protested against the voting of women; she felt it was most unwomanly to vote. In the borough in which she resided in 1871 there was a very close contest in the municipal election; she did not vote, for she had this sense of rebellion—this intuitive sense against that which was unwomanly. The morning after the election, she met one of the prominent gentlemen in the political party with which she sympathised (it chanced that the Liberals had won by a very small majority), and he said to her, "We did not receive any help from you yesterday, did we?" She told her she replied with great pride, "No; I don't wish to vote." She went a little further and met with one of her "friends," a man in whom she had great confidence, and who had won his seat in the Town Council by a majority of one, and he said to her, "I was not indebted for my seat in the Town Council to thy vote, was I?" She told her that she hesitated a little, and then she replied, "No, and I am ashamed of it." She said the whole question had assumed a new aspect to her mind, for she saw she had lost an

opportunity of assisting in putting a good man into the Town Council—perhaps his being there might have depended upon her vote, and she considered him the most valuable member there was in the Town Council. She said she approved his integrity and his principles, and remembering what she had lost upon that occasion, she had since that time not only voted at every election where she had the opportunity, but she had done everything she could to bring up every woman who had the right to vote. (Cheers.) She might say that this question of the womanly element in voting would generally be decided in that way. When women saw that they had the chance to press forward moral principles, the sentiments of duty would triumph over this unreasoning sense of the unwomanly. She was glad to say that it was triumphing. They found that where the sentiment was in favour of the women voting women did vote; and where the general sense of the community was opposed to it women did not vote. The majority of the Scotch members of Parliament was in favour of the measure, and when the School Board elections came up in Scotland there was a larger proportion of women voting than men. Public sentiment was in favour of it, and women had lost that unreasoning sense of the unwomanly. Not long since she was in the little borough of Grantham, and she was told that scarcely any woman in that borough voted, and in calling upon several of the leading people of the borough she found there was a very general sentiment against women voting. It was true that women dreaded to expose themselves to ridicule—there was nothing they dreaded so much, and there was nothing they would not sacrifice, except a strong moral sentiment, to avoid it; but this strong moral sentiment would triumph. With reference to Miss Nightingale going to the Crimea, there was at first a general sentiment that her course was unwomanly; but the moral sense of this country was not slow to appreciate the services she rendered there—and this moral sense triumphed over that unreasoning sense of the unwomanly. (Loud cheers.) Miss STURGE remarked that one of the previous speakers had said she had been disappointed in not having heard any reasons advanced by those who were against the claim for women's suffrage, but she could not say that she had ever had a sense of disappointment, because she knew that there were none. (Laughter.) She recollected that a member of Parliament, in objecting to women taking part in political life, saying that they must necessarily get their opinions second-hand. She thought surely he must necessarily get his opinions about women second-hand. That, perhaps, was the reason why it seemed to her that although men might be very logical about their own affairs, they utterly failed to be logical for women also. Women got blamed on all hands. If women would not work they were told to get married; if they expressed a wish to get married, they were laughed at and sneered at for setting their caps at men. (Laughter.) Was this fair? They heard women constantly blamed because they made a muddle when business affairs were brought before them. She knew, in the life she saw around her, that it was a common thing, when a father had some property, and when his son came of age, to give him an insight to business affairs, and also some money, but the girl was only allowed just enough perhaps for dress and pocket money. How then could she learn anything of business? Then there was plenty of money laid by for her as a marriage portion, or else was kept for her in the future; but somehow it was supposed that it could only be by the death of her nearest male relative that she could be made competent. Was this logical? She had noticed that frequently in the case of girls who must ultimately come into large wealth the money was all kept out of their control, and perhaps their

father lived so long that they were fifty or sixty years old before they got any control over it. (Laughter.) Was it likely that they could act discreetly with it because of that? Would not the wise and right way be that a girl should have some control of the money while her father was living, and show her how rightly to manage it? But she must say that, as far as she had seen, if a girl were fatherless she came into property when she came of age; and as that could not make her competent she would be far more competent if she were gradually trained as boys were, to acquire and dispose of it rightly. But the odd part of it was that if a girl showed a capacity for business, and wanted to go into business, the father would say he could not spare the money, the mother would say she could not spare her daughter, but if a suitor for the girl appeared, he might take the girl and the money to the antipodes. (Great laughter.) The father would find out that he could spare the money, the mother that she could spare her daughter. Was that logical? (A Voice: No, and laughter.) The most crushing thing with which people fell upon them was not logic, but woman's sphere. Now woman's sphere was a kind of extinguisher—very pleasant for those who were outside of it, but not so pleasant for those who were under it. An Englishman thought a woman was out of her sphere if her voice was heard in public; a Turk thought she was out of her sphere if her face was seen in public. Was there much logical difference between the two opinions? She thought there was a little delusion as to woman's sphere; she was inclined to think that half of what they were brought up to consider as modesty and as womanly, was moral cowardice. To show them what she meant, she would give them an instance about herself. A few weeks ago she was walking through the town of Birmingham, and she noticed a young man who looked to be consumptive. He was wheeling a handcart; but so feeble was he that he was obliged to get some one to help him to move the handcart from the pavement into the road. Then she noticed that he could only move it very feebly. She was not destitute of muscular strength, and should very much have liked to have helped him, but she did not wish to draw attention upon herself, which the wheeling of the handcart would have done. She supposed she would have been out of her sphere; she knew very well that this was not modesty—it was moral cowardice. Only the previous night, as she walked up the streets of Birmingham, about ten o'clock, she saw a girl about ten years old outside a public-house. She thought at first she would stop and speak to her, but then she thought she would not. She knew the girl would most likely tell her she was waiting for her father, and she did not feel prepared as she ought to have been to go into the public-house and tell him he ought to come out. It might be that she was keeping within woman's sphere; but she thought that in keeping within woman's sphere they were avoiding the sphere which God had designed for them. (Applause.) Surely His sphere was above and beyond anything that mortal man might consider woman's sphere. She noticed in Mr. Forster's speech at Bradford about education that he said he recollected some years ago, in the anti-slavery struggle, some women came over from America to the Anti-Slavery Conference, and they wanted to speak. The gentlemen, as some gentlemen were now, were afraid of the women, and did not wish to hear them speak. Mr. Forster said he himself recollected asking one lady why she was there. She replied, "This is a conference of persons interested in the suppression of the slave trade; am I not a person?" (Great laughter.) It was just their position about women's suffrage. She did not object to be disfranchised if she were not a ratepayer, but she did object to being disfranchised for being a woman. This was not just nor right—it was not reasonable.

CORRESPONDENCE.

LADIES' CLASSES AT THE ANDERSONIAN UNIVERSITY.

To the Editor of the Women's Suffrage Journal.

Madam,—Your correspondent, "A Friend to Education," calls attention to the "will" of the founder of the "Andersonian University," of Glasgow, as being favourable to the admission of women to certain classes or lectures. I cannot tell how it has fallen out of the programme to exclude women, but I attended there for two winters, thirty years ago, lectures on chemistry, by Professor Penny, with experiments; and natural philosophy lectures, Professor Wilson; music, Henry Lithgow. I had access at certain hours to the museum and library. All my life I have felt the very great advantage as an educational influence of these lectures, and cannot divine why they were given up, as they were immensely popular. The chemistry classes were not attended by many ladies, although they were the most interesting; the whole was open to both sexes. I hope some effort will be made to carry out the large-minded intentions of the founder, who, in the light of the present day, would I am sure throw open the whole university to women.—Yours truly,
MATERFAMILIAS.

TASKER'S CHARITY AT HAVERFORDWEST.

To the Editor of the Women's Suffrage Journal.

Madam—Allow me to call the attention of those among your readers who are interested in the cause of female education to the following facts, which appear in a little work recently published on the Charities of Haverfordwest, South Wales. A certain Mrs. Mary Tasker, some two hundred years ago, bequeathed lands for the purpose of founding a charity school for the poor children of both sexes. Now all these benefits for the last hundred years have been wholly usurped for the use of the boys alone, and I think it is high time that the authorities who are responsible for these proceedings should be called to account, and made, if possible, to refund some of the misappropriated monies. Having thus brought another instance of the manner in which the interests of our sex are cared for by men (even when they are legally responsible to the public for their acts), before your notice, allow me to remain, yours faithfully,
INCOGNITA.

"TASKER'S CHARITY SCHOOL FOUNDATION.

"Mrs. Mary Tasker, from whose benevolence this locally important charity sprang into existence, was of the family of Howard, or Haward, of Fletcherhill in the parish of Rudbaxton, to which reference has hereinbefore been made under the article on 'Haward or Howard's bequest.' Her residence was at Dudwell, in the parish of Camrose, and it is traditionally related that she was of such an extremely proud disposition that she had long narrow strips of blue cloth, with scarlet edging, laid along the road for her to walk over, so that she should not soil her shoes when she passed from her own house to attend divine service in her parish church. . . . This lady, by her will dated the 2nd day of August, 1684, gave to the mayor, aldermen, &c., of Haverfordwest, her farm of East Dudwell, containing 580 acres of enclosed and common (or it should properly be mountain) land in the parish of Camrose, in the county of Pembroke, for the purpose of founding a charity school for poor children of both sexes who, by the appointment of the mayor and common trustees should for ever thereafter be admitted thereto, with a competent maintenance to be allowed them yearly until apprenticed to convenient trades; and money to be given at setting out each apprentice, and also at the expiration

of their said apprenticeship. Such poor children to be admitted as well out of the parishes of Rudbaxton and Steynton as out of the said town of Haverfordwest; but the admission of girls has been discontinued for many years past, although there is no apparent provision in its stead for the education, &c., of those of the same sex as the donor, who have thus been deprived of the inestimable favour she had intended to confer upon them. . . . Trustees: William Rees, James Higgon, George Rowe, William Owen, and Thomas Rowlands, esquires, and Mr. John Phillips (druggist), also the Mayor of Haverfordwest, and the Ministers of Saint Mary, Saint Martin, Saint Thomas, all in Haverfordwest; and Rudbaxton and Steynton, in the county of Pembroke, for the time being, as ex-officio trustees. Clerk: Mr. Henry Davies."

MAINTENANCE OF WIVES.

This question lately received elucidation by the magistrates at Aldershot, as reported in a London paper:—

"At Aldershot, before the magistrates, Amy, the wife of an officer of the Artillery, addressed the magistrates as follows:—Will you have the goodness to favour me with your advice under the following circumstances, as I am too poor to go to a lawyer? I am the wife of Major Ward-Ashton, Royal Artillery, now stationed at the permanent barracks, and to whose battery the Prince Imperial of France was attached during the late summer drills. I am unable to live with my husband, owing to his cruel treatment. I have been married to him ten years, and during the whole of that time have only received from him £150, notwithstanding that he is the possessor of £7,000 a year, and the owner of Gorstage Hall, Chester. Owing to the difficulties in which he has placed me, my own property is so nearly mortgaged that I am unable to pay the interest on the mortgages, and I have only £20 a year to live on. During the past five years had it not been for my mother's friends I should have often wanted the common necessities of life. I owe Dr. Greenhalgh, of Grosvenor-street, £300, which my husband refuses to pay, and another large sum to one of the Queen's surgeons. I have placed this matter several times before the authorities at the Horse Guards, and the late Colonel Middleton, D.A.G., for artillery, who was most kind, and did all he could for me, but I could obtain no amelioration of my position, as my husband's conduct is not considered a military offence. The small debts I incurred for the common necessities of life he refuses to pay, thereby subjecting me to the most cowardly abuse and annoyance; and to strangers he denies that I am his wife. During the last interview I had with him some five years ago, he offered to provide me with a home if I consented to receive his German mistress as a friend. I have, at least, a dozen penitential letters, in which he confesses that he has cruelly treated me, and that his remorse will cease only with his death. Yet he has done nothing for me.

"The Chairman: We can do nothing for you unless you go to the Union. Can you not engage a solicitor?

"Applicant: I cannot; I am too poor. I do not know to whom I should apply for advice. I have not committed myself in any way, and he is bound to support me. He refuses to do so unless I consent to live in the same house with his mistress, which I never shall. (Applause.) If I take out a summons, do you think I can compel him to support me?

"Major Birch: We do not think you can.

"The Chairman: We could do nothing without incurring considerable expense. It is a hard case. We are sorry that we can do nothing for you.

"Applicant: Then I must try some other course. I am much obliged to your worships.

"Applicant, who was accompanied by her mother, then withdrew."

THE PROPERTY OF MARRIED WOMEN.

The following extracts from the laws of Delaware, U.S.A., will show the progress made in that State during the years 1873—1875, with regard to the property and status of married women:

PROPERTY OF MARRIED WOMEN, RENTS, &c.
The real and personal property of any married woman, heretofore acquired, now held, or which she may hereafter acquire in any manner whatsoever from any person other than her husband, shall be her sole and separate property, and the rents, issues, and profits thereof shall not be subject to the disposal of her husband, nor liable for his debts.

JUDGMENT AGAINST.
All debts contracted before marriage, or by her authority after, shall be a charge on her real and personal property, and judgment may be recovered against it.

WAGES, SUIT, DEPOSITS.
Any married woman may receive wages for her personal labour not performed for the family, maintain an action therefor in her own name, and hold in her own right. She may deposit the same, or any other money belonging to her, in any bank or other institution, subject to her sole right to withdraw the same in whole or in part at any time without the consent of her husband.

PROSECUTION AND DEFENCE, HUSBAND CANNOT SUE, CONTRACTS.
Any married woman may prosecute and defend suits at law or in equity for the preservation of her property, as if unmarried, or may do it jointly with her husband, but he alone cannot maintain an action respecting his wife's property. And it shall be lawful for any married woman to make any and all manner of contracts with respect to her own property, and maintain suits on such contracts, as though she were a *feme sole*.

WILL, COURTESY, DESCENT.
Any married woman, twenty-one years of age and upward, may dispose of her property both real and personal, by will, but such disposal shall not affect the rights of her husband as tenant by the courtesy. If she die intestate, her property shall descend to her heirs as provided by law.

CONTRACT, DYING INTESTATE.
A husband and wife may make a marriage contract, and provide for the disposition of their property at death, and may bar each other of all rights not so secured to them. And where a married woman shall die intestate without lawful issue, her husband shall be entitled to hold one-half of her real estate during his natural life.

LEASE OF POWER.
Any married woman may give her husband the right to control her property, or any part thereof, and may revoke the same in writing.

WAGES.
The wages of any married woman shall be exempt from attachment for debt.

EXECUTRIX.
A married woman may act as an executrix or administratrix independent of her husband, nor shall he be liable for any act or default of hers in such capacity, unless he is a party to her bound as such.

PURCHASE OF REAL ESTATE.
A married woman may purchase real estate, mortgage the same, or make other contracts for the payment of money, and her husband shall not be liable unless he be a party thereto.

In England, in spite of the passing of the Act of 1870, the real property of a married woman still passes under the control of her husband for his life, and the "rents, issues, and profits thereof," are subject to his disposal, and liable for his debts. So also with her personal property. Any portion of it not specially protected becomes his as heretofore.

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY COMMITTEE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS RECEIVED DURING DECEMBER, 1875.

| | £ | s. | d. |
|-------------------------------------|----|----|----|
| Thomas Thomasson, Esq. | 50 | 0 | 0 |
| Mrs. Evans | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| Mrs. Mc Laren (Edinburgh) | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Mrs. Cobden (Midhurst) | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Madame Venturi | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Miss Theodosia Marshall | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| James Smith, Esq. | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Mrs. Jacob | 0 | 2 | 6 |

URSULA M. BRIGHT, Treasurer. £71 0 6

N.B.—Forms of petition in favour of Mr. Russell Gurney and Mr. Shaw Lefevre's Bill, with leaflets and all information, to be obtained from the Secretary, Mrs. Wolstenholme Elmy, Congleton, Cheshire.

MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS RECEIVED DURING DECEMBER, 1875.

| | £ | s. | d. |
|--|-----|----|----|
| A Friend | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| A. G. (Isle of Wight) | 50 | 0 | 0 |
| M. P. | 50 | 0 | 0 |
| Miss Siddon | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Miss Humble | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Mr. R. Nicholson | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Mr. F. Eastwood | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| A Friend (Huddersfield) | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Mr. W. R. Callender, M.P. | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Mr. Woodhead (Huddersfield) | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Mr. R. Gill | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Mr. A. Crowther | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Mr. Wm. Marriott | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Mr. Denham | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Mrs. Edward Brooke | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Mrs. Muir | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| B. | 0 | 10 | 6 |
| Mr. J. Glaisyer | 0 | 10 | 6 |
| Mr. F. F. Abbey | 0 | 10 | 6 |
| Rev. J. L. Rentoul | 0 | 10 | 6 |
| Dr. Whiteside | 0 | 10 | 6 |
| Mrs. Cooper | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| W. A. (Huddersfield) | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| J. R. | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Miss Octavia Brooke | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Mr. J. Grist | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Mr. Thos. Kilner | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Mr. H. Atherton (Southport) | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Mr. J. Gillett | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| E. H. | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Mrs. C. J. Brook | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Miss Thomas (Ashton-under-Lyne) | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Mr. Laycock | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Dr. Cameron | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Mr. C. Whitmell | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| J. H. | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Mr. John Barrow | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Mrs. Rimmer | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| O. A. C. | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Mrs. M'Kerrow (Southport) | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Mr. Moses Hadfield | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Mr. Randal Ridgway | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Mr. Baker | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Mrs. Unwin | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Mr. J. W. Cox | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Mrs. Brine | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Mr. T. Walker | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| A Friend (Huddersfield) | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Miss M. Kitrick | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Miss Barker | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Mr. J. Bowers | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Mrs. Elliott | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Mr. Joseph Haigh | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Mrs. Etchells | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Miss Crosland | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Mr. Chatterton | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Mrs. Noton | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| B. B. | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Mr. Dunlop | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Miss Gurney | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Miss Amy Gurney | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Mrs. Lundy | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Mrs. Monkhouse | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Mrs. Robertson | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Mr. Geo. Robinson | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| A Friend (Huddersfield) | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Mrs. Serjeant | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Miss M. Houghton | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Miss Crook | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Mr. J. Lawton | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Collected by Mrs. Wright in smaller sums | 0 | 10 | 0 |

£233 0 0

S. ALFRED STEINTHAL.

Cheques and Post Office Orders should be made payable to the Treasurer, Rev. S. ALFRED STEINTHAL, and may be sent either direct to him at The Limes, Nelson-street, Chorlton-on-Medlock; or to the Secretary, Miss BECKER, 28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

Contributions to the funds of the Central Committee of the National Society for Women's Suffrage, 64, Berners Street, London, W., from November 21st to December 20th, 1875.

| | £ | s. | d. |
|---------------------|-----|----|----|
| Misses Ashworth | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Mrs. Branch | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Miss Bostock | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Mrs. Glover | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Miss Thomas | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Mr. A. J. Williams | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Mr. J. Boyd-Kinnear | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Anonymous | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| A Friend in Need | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Miss M. Chapman | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Dr. Lowe | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Mr. H. P. Plowright | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Mr. Wilkins | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Admiral Young | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| A Friend (Lyman) | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Miss Heblethwaite | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Mrs. Perrier | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Mrs. Knight | 0 | 2 | 0 |

£110 9 6

ALFRED W. BENNETT, Treasurer.

BRISTOL AND WEST OF ENGLAND SOCIETY.

SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR DECEMBER, 1875.

| | £ | s. | d. |
|----------------------|---|----|----|
| Handel Cossham, Esq. | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| The Misses Marriott | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Miss Julia Anthony | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Mrs. Austin | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Mr. John Batchelor | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Mrs. Frazer | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Mr. Hutchinson | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Mrs. Reid | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Mrs. Julius Smith | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Mrs. Spencer | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Rev. J. J. Brown | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Rev. T. G. Rooke | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Mr. Bunce | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Miss Pigou | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Mrs. Bishop | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Miss Howell | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Mr. Akery | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Rev. E. Bayliffe | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Mrs. Bayliffe | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Mr. Herbert | 0 | 1 | 0 |

£5 10 0

ALICE GRENFELL, 5, Albert Villas, Clifton, Office: 53, Park Street, Bristol. Treasurer.

DRAWING-ROOM MEETING.

A drawing-room meeting was held November 4th at 80, York Place, by the kindness of Mrs. Hamilton. After short addresses from Miss Anna Swanwick and Miss Caroline Biggs, the discussion became general, Mr. W. T. Blair, Mr. Leon, and several others taking part. We would point out to the friends of our cause the signal help which they can render by promoting these quiet, informal drawing-room discussions.

INFANT MORTALITY.—We are not in the habit of writing in commendation of Patent Medicines generally, but as a safe remedy for difficult teething, convulsions, flatulency, and affections of the bowels is frequently required, we earnestly call the attention of Mothers to Atkinson and Barker's Royal Infants' Preservative. Unlike those pernicious stupefactive which tend to weaken and prevent the growth of children, this Preservative gradually improves the health and strengthens the constitution, and from its simplicity, in no case can it do harm, indeed it may be given with safety immediately after birth. For nearly a century this real Preservative of Infants' Life has been recognised throughout the world as the best Medicine for all disorders of Infants, and is sold by Chemists everywhere, in 1s. 1½d. Bottles of the same quality as supplied to Queen Victoria for the Royal Children.—[ADVT.]