

# WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

VOL. IV.—No. 39. PUBLISHED MONTHLY.

MANCHESTER, MAY 1, 1873.

PRICE 1d.—By Post 1½d.

## Contents :

Leading Articles by the Editor.  
Parliamentary Intelligence :—Summary of Debate on the Women's Disabilities Bill, and Division List.  
Memorials to Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Disraeli.  
School Board Elections in Scotland.  
Public Meetings :—England : Great Meeting in the Hanover Square Rooms, London ; Edgware, Hampstead, Wimbledon, Chelsea, Peckham, Islington,

Northampton, Norwich, Bury St. Edmund's, Liverpool, Brighton, North Bow. Scotland : Coldstream, Glasgow, Dunfermline, Inverkeithing, Kilsyth, Port Bannatyne, Alloa, Kirkcaldy.  
The Property of Married Women.  
Summary of Petitions.  
Committees.  
Obituary.

Manchester City Council.  
Bath Town Council.  
The Mutiny Acts of 1873 :—Report of the Vigilance Committee ; Proceedings in the House of Lords.  
Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage :—Offer of Two Hundred Guineas ; Treasurer's Report for April.  
Central Committee :—Subscriptions and Donations.

THE vote yesterday for the second reading of the Women's Disabilities Bill was the largest that has yet been given for the measure. Mr. JACOB BRIGHT took 155 members into the lobby, an increase of 12 over the numbers of last year, while Mr. BOUVERIE mustered exactly the same following as on the previous division, namely, 222. The hostile majority is reduced from 79 to 67, a circumstance which gives reasonable encouragement to the friends of the cause to expect that perseverance in the demand for the measure will be rewarded by constantly increasing support in the House of Commons, and at no distant date by the conversion of the minority into a majority.

The debate was as usual opened by Mr. JACOB BRIGHT, in a speech of great power and persuasiveness. Leaving untouched the ground he occupied on former occasions, he addressed himself to arguments for the Bill derived mainly from recent events, and present and prospective legislation, and gave a masterly exposition of the bearing of these matters on the measure he was advocating. The only cause for regret in connection with this speech is the fact that it had to be delivered so early in the debate. Later in the day the House was full and animated, and according to the *Daily News*, the appearance an hour before the division would almost have indicated that some great party fight, big with the fate of a ministry, was being fought out. But the mover and seconder of a Bill on a Wednesday have always the disadvantage of speaking in a comparatively empty House, and their arguments do not reach the ears of those on whose vote the decision rests. Mr. EASTWICK seconded the motion for the second reading of the Bill, and then followed Mr. BOUVERIE and Mr. SCOURFIELD, who moved and seconded the amendment in speeches of much the same purport as those given by them on previous occasions. Mr. SERJEANT SHERLOCK supported and Mr. LEATHAM opposed the Bill. Lord JOHN MANNERS made an able and forcible speech in favour of the measure, and Mr. BRUCE gave what he took care to inform the House were his own views only, and

not those of the Government, members of which he was bound to admit were divided in opinion on this matter. After an address in his usual style by Mr. BERESFORD HOPE, Mr. FAWCETT rose, and in a speech of remarkable ability, which was listened to with the closest attention by a full House, replied to the objections that had been advanced against the measure. He was followed by Mr. HERON, who supported the Bill, and by Earl PERCY, Mr. GOLDNEY, and Mr. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN, who successively opposed it. Perhaps the most noteworthy incident of the debate then followed in the short and characteristic speech of the Right Hon. J. W. HENLEY, who rose to say that though he had hitherto opposed the Bill, he would now support it, from his observation of the manner in which women had exercised the franchise in municipal and school board elections. Mr. NEWDEGATE, in sepulchral tones, deplored that the measure should receive so much support from his party, and solemnly adjured the House not to accept the Bill. Sir JOHN TRELAWNEY supported, and Mr. GREENE opposed the Bill ; and after a few words from Mr. JACOB BRIGHT, the division took place with the result given above.

Of members connected with the Government who took part in the division, Mr. STANSFELD and Mr. HIBBERT supported the Bill, and Mr. BRUCE, Mr. CARDWELL, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. GRANT DUFF, Mr. GLYN, Mr. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN, Mr. LOWE, Sir HENRY STORKS, and Mr. WINTERBOTHAM voted against it. Of the leaders of the Conservative party, Mr. DISRAELI, Sir CHAS. ADDERLEY, Mr. GORDON, Mr. WARD HUNT, Lord JOHN MANNERS, and Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE voted for the Bill, and Mr. GATHORNE HARDY against it.

The minority of 155 in favour of the Bill contains 109 Liberals and 46 Conservatives. Last year there voted for the Bill 105 Liberals and 38 Conservatives. The Bill has therefore gained additional support on both sides of the House. The majority consisted of 116 Liberals and 106 Conservatives. The 222 last year



contained 114 Liberals and 108 Conservatives. Eighteen of those who voted this year in favour of the measure were new adherents, of these 11 are Liberals and 7 Conservatives. Of these 18 four had formerly voted against the Bill, and four have been returned to Parliament since the division of last year, three to replace former supporters from Aberdeen, Cork, and Preston, and one returned in place of an opponent, for Forfarshire.

The general result of the division is of an encouraging character. The full strength of the opposition appears to be measured by the remarkable persistency of the numbers at 220 or 222, which has been maintained for four successive years, while the supporters have increased during that period from 122 to 155. The franchise for men householders was not obtained without long and persistent labour through worse discouragements than those which we have to encounter. The question of the franchise for women householders is now treated on all hands as one of grave political importance, and it needs but to persevere in the demand for it to obtain a satisfactory solution at no distant date.

THE demonstrations in favour of the Bill have continued with unabated energy during the month. Many public meetings have been held in various parts of the country, and a crowded meeting in London, under the presidency of Mr. EASTWICK, in the Hanover Square Rooms, took place on Monday last. The petitions reported in the *Times* as having been presented in favour of the Bill latterly numbered from seventy to ninety each day, and occupied a considerable length of the column devoted to such intelligence. The total number of signatures up to April 29 is 276,715, being the largest number that has been sent in for any object this session, and many petitions, memorials, and letters have been received by members from their constituents urging the measure on their consideration. Such representations cannot fail to have much weight with members, who naturally and properly pay great attention to the views of their constituents on questions of public policy. We thank those friends of the cause who have taken this method of exerting influence in favour of the measure, and we exhort them to continue to bring the matter before their representatives on every suitable occasion until the victory is won.

We desire to call especial attention to the advertisement on our last page, containing the conditional offer of two hundred guineas to the funds of this Society, and to

express our earnest hope that our friends will make such efforts on our behalf as shall enable us to announce in our next issue that the conditions have been accomplished and the full sum of two thousand guineas obtained.

OWING to pressure of time and space we are unable to give the full report of the Parliamentary debate in this number of the *Journal*, but we give the summary abridged from the *Times*, and the division list. Next month we shall give the usual full report of the debate in the House of Commons.

### PARLIAMENTARY INTELLIGENCE.

*House of Commons, April 30.*

Summary of the debate on the Women's Disabilities Bill, abridged from the *Times*.

Mr. JACOB BRIGHT, in moving the second reading, referred, first, at some length to Mr. Gladstone's speech in opposition to it, pointing out to him that his great objection to exposing women to the tumult of a contested election was now done away with by the Ballot. Addressing himself to the Radicals, he examined the arguments in favour of Mr. Trevelyan's Bill for reducing the County Franchise—showing that they all applied with equal force to the present Bill. Next, he dwelt on the injustice done to women as women, not only in political but social matters, such as the exclusion of women farmers, of whom there are many, from taking part in the competitions of the Royal Agricultural Society. As one proof of the fitness of women for political functions, he referred to Her Majesty's conduct in the recent ministerial crisis, and read Mr. Disraeli's description of the functions of the Sovereign. Among other arguments he cited the manner in which women had exercised the municipal franchise, and the fact that, according to the criminal returns female crime was much below the average of male crime, and urged the injustice of denying to women representation in an Assembly which legislated on their labour.

Mr. EASTWICK, in supporting the Bill, derided the fallacy that men and women are essentially different in their nature. On the contrary, he asserted that if the sexes were educated alike, women would be as fit for any profession as men, and as an instance of their capacity even for military pursuits, he instanced Joan of Arc, the female aide-de-camp of Langewitz in the Polish insurrection, and the Ranee of Jhansi. But women had no desire to step out of their ordinary sphere; and among other reasons he urged that women suffrage would erect a barrier against "manhood suffrage."

Mr. BOUVERIE, in moving the rejection of the Bill, asked Mr. Eastwick whether he proposed to recruit the army from the female sex, and whether it was to be the next women's grievance that they were excluded from competing for commissions. He believed that the agitation was repugnant to the great mass of public opinion, both male and female, in this country, and if a general election were taken on the issue not a single member would be returned in favour of it. As to the Bath election there were more spinsters there than in any city in the country, which might account for the candidates promising to support the Bill. Replying to Mr. Bright's argument he asked him to mention an instance in which Parliament had refused to consider a female grievance, and retorted that, if women were turned into men, as this Bill proposed, as

they were most numerous, female crime would soon surpass male crime. But he objected to the Bill chiefly because of the consequences it would lead to—a revolution as important as ever had happened in this country. If the vote were given to spinsters and widows it must be extended to married women. It would be impossible to exclude women from Parliament, and ultimately from all male careers. But women were naturally weaker than men, and if exposed to competition they must go to the wall, and would be unsexed.

Mr. SCOURFIELD seconded the amendment, being of opinion that women did not want the suffrage. If they did they would very soon get it, whether the other sex wished it or not.

Mr. LEATHAM insisted that, if spinsters got the vote, it must be extended to married women, and must include a seat in Parliament. Dilating on this theme, he drew a ludicrous picture of the inconveniences to public business which might be caused by the elopement of a "Solicitor-General" with the Attorney-General, or the *accouchement* of a Prime Minister. As to the Ballot—that would not avail to settle political differences in families, and women, he contended, had already sufficient political influence, which was exercised in an unobjectionable manner.

Lord J. MANNERS remarked that hitherto the only arguments against the measure were "sarcasm and sentiment," directed entirely to matters not included in the Bill, but which were expected to flow from it. But by passing this Bill as it stood the agitation would be stopped.

Mr. BRUCE, premising that he spoke for himself and not for the Government, declined to believe that a demand urged on the ground of the political equality of the sexes could be satisfied by this Bill. He based his opposition to the measure on the dissimilarity of the sexes, appealing to history and to universal experience in proof of the magnitude of the proposed innovation.

Mr. FAWCETT went at some length through the arguments against the Bill, answering each in turn; and Mr. HENLEY, hitherto an opponent of the Bill, avowed himself a convert now from his observation of the wholesome operation of Female Suffrage at the Municipal and School Board Elections.

Mr. GOLDNEY, on the other hand, avowed himself a convert in the contrary sense, and the Bill was also opposed by Mr. B Hope, Earl Percy, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Newdegate, and Mr. Greene. Mr. Serjeant Sherlock, Mr. Heron, and Sir J. Trelawny spoke in favour of the Bill. On a division it was thrown out by 222 to 155.

### DIVISION LIST.

Order for Second Reading read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time:"—Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months:"—(Mr. Bouverie)—Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:"—The House divided; Ayes 155, Noes 222.

### AYES.

Adderley, Right Hon. Sir Charles	Beach, W. W. Bramston (Hants N)
Amplett, Richard P.	Beaumont, Major Fred. (Durh. S.)
Anderson, George	Beresford, Colonel Marcus
Anstruther, Sir Robert	Birley, Hugh
Antrobus, Sir Edmund	Blennerhasset, Rowld. P. (Kerry)
Bagwell, John	Brand, Henry Robert
Baines, Edward	Brocklehurst, William C.
Barclay, James William (Forfar)	Brown, Alexander H. (Wenlock)
Bassett, Francis	Browne, George Elkins (Mayo)
Bateson, Sir Thomas	Buckley, Nathaniel (Stalybridge)
Bathurst, Allen Alexander	Cameron, Donald
Bazley, Sir Thomas	Carter, Robert M.

Cawley, Charles E.	Kinnaird, Hon. Arthur Fitzgerald
Chadwick, David	Knightley, Sir Rainald
Charley, William Thomas	Lambert, Nathaniel Grace
Cholmeley, Captain (Grantham)	Lancaster, John
Clifford, Charles Cavendish	Langton, W. Gore
Corrigan, Sir Dominic	Lawson, Sir Wilfrid
Cowper-Temple, Rt. Hon. W. (H'ts.)	Leith, John Farley
Cubitt, George	Lewis, Harvey (Marylebone)
Dalway, Marriott Robert	Liddell, Hon. Henry George
Danter, Captain Dawson	Lusk, Dr.
Davie, Sir H. R. Ferguson (Hadd.)	Lusk, Andrew
Delahunty, James	Macfie, Robert Andrew
Dickinson, Sebastian S.	MacClure, Thomas
Dickson, Major Alex. G. (Dover)	MacLagan, Peter
Digby, Kenelm Thomas	MacLaren, Duncan
Dilke, Sir Charles Wentworth	Maitland, Sir Alex. C. R. Gibson
Dillwyn, Lewis Llewelyn	Manners, Rt. Hon. Lord J. (Leic. N.)
Dimsdale, Robert	Mellor, Thomas W.
Disraeli, Right Hon. Benjamin	Melly, George
Dixon, George (Birmingham)	Miall, Edward
Dodds, Joseph	Miller, John
Downing, M'Carthy	Mitchell, Thomas Alexander
Elliot, George	Morley, Samuel
Ewing, H. Ewing Crum (Paisley)	Morrison, Walter
Ewing, Archibald Orr (Dunbart.)	Mundella, Anthony John
Fawcett, Henry	Muntz, Philip Henry
Figgins, James	Neville-Grenville, Ralph
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond	Northcote, Rt. Hon. Sir Stafford H.
Fletcher, Isaac	Ogilvy, Sir John
Forester, Rt. Hon. General	Palmer, John Hinde
Fowler, R. N. (Penryn)	Playfair, Lyon
French, Rt. Hon. Colonel	Potter, Thos. Bayley (Rochdale)
Gavin, Major	Powell, Walter (Malmesbury)
Goldsmid, Sir Francis (Reading)	Price, Wm. Edwin (Tewkesbury)
Gordon, Edward Strathearn	Redmond, William Archer
Gourley, Edward T.	Reed, Charles (Hackney)
Graham, William	Richard, Henry (Merthyr Tydfil)
Gray, Sir John (Kilkenny)	Robertson, David
Greaves, Edward	Ronayne, Joseph Philip
Grieve, Jas. Johnstone (Greenock)	Round, James
Grosvenor, Hn. Norman (Chester)	Rylands, Peter
Hadfield, George	Samuelson, Hen. B. (Cheltenham)
Hanbury, Robert William	Selwin-Ibbetson, Sir Henry J.
Hardcastle, Joseph Alfred	Shaw, Richard (Burnley)
Harris, John Dove	Sheridan, Henry B.
Henderson, John	Sherlock, David
Henley, Rt. Hon. J. W. (Oxfordsh)	Sheriff, Alexander Clunes
Herbert, Hn. Auberon E. W. (Not.)	Simon, Mr. Sergeant
Heron, Edward	Sinclair, Sir John G. Tollemache
Heron, Denis Caulfield	Smith, Eustace (Tynemouth)
Heygate, Wm. Unwin (Leic. S.)	Smyth, Patrick Jas. (Westmeath)
Hibbert, John Tomlinson	Stacpoole, William
Hick, John	Stansfeld, Right Hon. James
Hill, Alexander Staveley	Talbot, Chris. R. M. (Glam.)
Hoare, Sir H. Ainslie (Chelsea)	Taylor, Peter Alfred (Leicester)
Hodgkinson, Grosvenor	Torrens, W. T. M'Callagh (Finsb.)
Holker, John	Trelawny, Sir John Salusbury
Holmesdale, Viscount	Trevelyan, George Otto
Holt, James Maden	Villiers, Right Hon. C. Pelham
Howard, James (Bedford)	West, Henry Wyndham
Hunt, Rt. Hon. George Ward	Wheelhouse, William S. J.
Jackson, Ralph Ward	White, James (Brighton)
Jenkinson, Sir George S.	Willyams, E. W. Brydges (Corn. E.)
Johnston, William (Belfast)	Wingfield, Sir Charles
Johnstone, Sir Harcourt (Scarbo.)	Young, Adolph. Wm. (Helston)
King, Hon. P. Jn. Locke	

Tellers for the Ayes Mr. Jacob Bright and Mr. Eastwick.

### NOES.

Adair, Hugh Edward	Bartlet, Colonel
Akroyd, Edward	Bass, Arthur (Staffordshire E.)
Amcotts, Colonel W. Cracroft	Bates, Edward
Annesley, Hon. Colonel Hugh	Beach, Sir Michael Hicks (Glos. E.)
Archdale, Captain Morvyn	Beaumont, W. B. (Northum. S.)
Armistead, George	Bentinck, G. Cavendish (Whit'vn.)
Assheton, Ralph	Bontinck, George W. P. (Norf. W.)
Aytoun, Roger Sinclair	Bolckow, Henry W. F.
Bagge, Sir William	Bonham-Carter, John
Barnett, Henry	Bourne, Colonel
Barrington, Viscount	Bowmont, Marquis of (Roxburgh)



Bowring, Edgar A.  
Brady, John  
Brassey, Thomas (Hastings)  
Brinckman, Captain  
Broadley, Wm. H. Harrison  
Brooks, William Cunliffe  
Bruce, Rt. Hon. H. Austin (Renfr.)  
Bruen, Henry  
Cadogan, Hon. Frederick W.  
Candlish, John  
Cardwell, Rt. Hon. Edward  
Carington, Hon. Capt. William  
Cartwright, Fairfax (Northamp.)  
Cartwright, Wm. C. (Oxfords.)  
Cave, Rt. Hon. S. (New Shoreham)  
Cavendish, Lord F.C. (York, W.R.)  
Cavendish, Lord G. (Derbysh. N.)  
Ceil, Lord Eustace H. B. G.  
Child, Sir Smith  
Childers, Right Hon. Hugh  
Cholmeley, Sir Montague (Linc.N.)  
Clay, James  
Clive, Col. Hon. G. Windsor  
Cobbett, John Morgan  
Cochrane, Alex. D. W. R. Baillie  
Cogan, Rt. Hon. Wm. Hy. Ford  
Cole, Col. Hon. Henry Arthur  
Colebrooke, Sir Thos. Edward  
Conolly, Thomas  
Corry, Hon. Henry Wm. Lowry  
Craulard, Edw. Henry J. (Ayr)  
Crawford, Rob. Wygram (London)  
Croft, Sir Herbert G. D.  
Cross, Richard Assheton  
Cunliffe, Sir Robert Alfred  
Dalrymple, Donald, (Bath)  
Dalrymple, Charles (Butesh)  
Davenport, William Bromley  
Davies, Richard (Anglesey)  
Dick, Fitzwilliam  
Dodson, Rt. Hon. John George  
Dowdeswell, William Edward  
Duff, Mount. Elph. Grant (Elgin)  
Duff, Robert William (Banffsh.)  
Duncombe, Hon. Colonel  
Dundas, Lawrence  
Eaton, Henry William  
Edwards, Henry  
Egerton, Hn. Alg. Fulke (Lanc. S.)  
Egerton, Hon. Wilb. (Chesh. M.)  
Erskine, Admiral John E.  
Esmonde, Sir John  
Eykyn, Roger  
Feilden, Hen. Master (Blackburn)  
Fielden, Joshua (Yk. W. R. (E. D.)  
Fitzwilliam, Hon. C. W. W. (Malt.)  
Floyer, John  
Foljambe, Francis John Savile  
Forde, Colonel  
Foster, Wm. Henry (Bridgnorth)  
Fowler, William (Camb. Bo.)  
Gallwey, Sir William Payne  
Galway, Viscount  
Gladstone, Wm. Henry (Whitby)  
Glyn, Hon. George Grenfell  
Goldney, Gabriel  
Goldsmid, Julian (Rochester)  
Gore, J. Ralph Ormsby (Salop. N.)  
Gower, Hn. E. F. Leveson (Bodm.)  
Greene, Edward  
Greville, Hon. Capt. (Westmeath)  
Greville-Nugent, Hn. G. F. (Long.)  
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Geo. (Morpeth)  
Grosvenor, Capt. R. W. (Westmin.)  
Grove, Thomas Fraser  
Guest, Arthur E. (Poole)  
Guest, Montague John (Youghal)  
Hamilton, John G. C. (Lanarks. S.)  
Hardy, Rt. Hon. Gathorne (Ox. U.)  
Hardy, John (Warwick, S.)  
Hardy, John Stewart (Rye)  
Hay, Sir John C. Dalrymple  
Headlam, Rt. Hon. T. Emerson  
Henley, Lord (Northampton)  
Henry, Jn. Snowdon (Lanc. S.E.)  
Hervey, Lord Augustus H. C.  
Hodgson, W. Nicholson (Cumb. E.)  
Holland, Samuel  
Holms, John  
Hood, Capt. Hon. Arthur W. A. N.  
Hope, Alex. J. B. Beresford  
Howard, Hn. Chas. W. G. (Cumb.)  
Hutton, John  
James, Henry  
Kavanagh, Arthur MacN.  
Kingscote, Colonel  
Knatchbull-Hugessen, Rt. Hon. E.  
Knox, Hon. Colonel Stuart  
Laird, John  
Lawrence, Sir Jas. C. (Lambeth)  
Lawrence, William (London)  
Learnmonth, Alexander  
Leatham, Edward Aldam  
Leeman, George  
Legh, Wm. J. (Chesh. E.)  
Lennox, Lord G. Gordon (Lym.)  
Lewis, Chas. Edwd. (Londondy.)  
Lewis, John D. (Davenport)  
Lindsay, Hon. Col. C. (Abing.)  
Lindsay, Col. R. Loyd (Berks.)  
Locke, John  
Lorne, Marquis of  
Lowe, Rt. Hon. Robert  
Lyttleton, Hon. Charles George  
M'Arthur, William  
March, Earl of  
Marling, Samuel Stephens  
Matthews, Henry  
Mitford, William Townley  
Monckton, Hon. Geo. (Notts.)  
Monk, Charles James  
Morgan, C. Octavius (Monmouth.)  
Morgan, Geo. Osborne (Denbigh.)  
Mowbray, Rt. Hon. John Robert  
Muncaster, Lord  
Munster, William Felix  
Nowdegate, Charles Newdigate  
Newport, Viscount  
Nicholson, William  
North, Colonel  
Norwood, Charles Morgan  
O'Conor, Denis Maurice (Sligo Co.)  
O'Conor, Don, The (Roscommon)  
O'Donoghue, The  
O'Reilly, Myles Wm. (Longford)  
Patten, Rt. Hon. Colonel Wilson  
Pease, Joseph Whitwell  
Peel, Arthur Wellesley (Warw.)  
Pemberton, Edward Leigh  
Perey, Earl  
Philips, R. Needham  
Pim, Jonathan  
Plunket, Hon. David Robert  
Portman, Hon. W. Hen. B.  
Price, William Philip (Gloucester)  
Raikes, Henry Cecil  
Ramsden, Sir John W.  
Ridley, Matthew White  
Rothschild, Nath. M. de (Aylesb.)  
Sackville, Sackville G. Stopford  
St. Aubyn, Sir John  
Salt, Thomas  
Samuda, Joseph D'Agnilar  
Samuelson, Bernhard (Banbury)  
Seeley, Charles (Nottingham)  
Seymore, Alfred  
Simonds, William Barrow  
Smith, Abel (Herts.)  
Smith, Rowland (Derbyshire S.)  
Smith, Samuel Geo. (Aylesbury)  
Stanley, Hon. Fred. (Lanc. N.)  
Stanley, Hn. Wm. Owen (Beaum.)  
Stapleton, John  
Stevenson, James Cochran  
Stone, William Henry  
Storks, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry Knight

Stronge, Sir James M.  
Strutt, Hon. Henry  
Stuart, Colonel  
Sturt, Lient-Col. Napier (Dorchest.)  
Sykes, Christopher  
Talbot, John Gilbert (Kent. W.)  
Talbot, Hon. Captain (Staff)  
Tipping, William  
Tollemache, Hn. Fred. J. (Granth.)  
Torrens, Sir Rob. R. (Camb. Boro.)  
Tracy, Hn. Chas. R. D. Hanbury  
Trench, Hon. Major W. le Poer  
Turner, Charles (Lanc. S. W.)  
Vivian, Henry Hussey (Glamor.)  
Vivian, Arthur P. (Cornwall, W.)  
Walker, Lt.-Col. Geo. Gustavus  
Walpole, Hn. Fred. (Norf. N.)

Tellers for the Noes Mr. Bouverie and Mr. Scourfield.

FOR.		AGAINST.	
Colonel Ruggles Brise	Mr. Keown	Mr. Keown	
Mr. Thomas Hughes	Mr. J. W. Malcolm	Mr. J. W. Malcolm	
Mr. Hoskyns	Mr. Arkwright	Mr. Arkwright	
Mr. Finrie	Mr. Ennis	Mr. Ennis	
Mr. Dalglish	Mr. Monsell	Mr. Monsell	
Mr. J. R. Yorke	Captain Egerton	Captain Egerton	
Mr. W. Shaw	Lord Charles Bruce	Lord Charles Bruce	
Colonel Gilpin	Mr. R. Bright	Mr. R. Bright	
Sir M. Lopes	Mr. E. Potter	Mr. E. Potter	
Mr. W. S. Allen	Mr. H. Lopes	Mr. H. Lopes	
Mr. Pender	Lord Crichton	Lord Crichton	
Sir D. Wedderburn	Mr. Maxwell	Mr. Maxwell	
Mr. H. Herbert	Mr. Ormsby Gore	Mr. Ormsby Gore	
Mr. Campbell Bannerman	Mr. Horsman	Mr. Horsman	
Colonel Gray	Mr. H. G. Sturt	Mr. H. G. Sturt	

#### MEMORIALS TO MR. GLADSTONE AND TO MR. DISRAELI.

The Memorials to Mr. Gladstone and to Mr. Disraeli have each received upwards of eleven thousand signatures. They were headed by the names of Harriet Martineau, Florence Nightingale, Frances Power Cobbe, Viscountess Amberley, Jessie Boucherett, Josephine Butler, and others, including the principal workers in the suffrage movement. The Memorial to Mr. Gladstone was forwarded to him by Mr. Jacob Bright, M.P., and Mr. Gladstone, in acknowledging it, expressed his sense of the importance to be attached to it.—The Memorial to Mr. Disraeli was presented by Mr. W. H. Gore Langton, M.P., who had an interview, by appointment, with the right honourable gentleman for the purpose. Mr. Disraeli expressed himself as much gratified by the receipt of the memorial.

#### SCHOOL BOARD ELECTIONS IN SCOTLAND.

Eighteen ladies have been already elected to School Boards in Scotland. Six have headed the poll in their respective districts. Four have been returned for Edinburgh, two for the city, and two for the districts of Liberton and St. Cuthbert's. Other places which have returned ladies are Gourrock, Haddington, Montrose, Prestonpans, Lady Kirk, Gask, Kiltarn, Pencaitland, Huntly, Ross, Sheen, and Paisley.

The London Republican Club is not the only social institution admitting women upon equal terms to its membership. They are, and long have been, received as members of the Birkbeck Institution and its various classes; and the new Quebec Institute, in Marylebone, draws no distinction between the sexes, provided the candidates for membership be of sufficient age and willing to comply with the conditions and regulations governing all its plans.

#### PUBLIC MEETINGS.

LONDON.

##### GREAT MEETING IN THE HANOVER SQUARE ROOMS.

On Monday evening, April 28th, a public meeting was held in London in the Hanover Square Rooms. Long before the hour at which the chair was taken, the large hall was crowded in every part, and when at eight o'clock Mr. Eastwick, M.P., the chairman, Miss Becker, and other leaders of the movement, came upon the platform, a most enthusiastic demonstration took place. Amongst those present were—R. Ward Jackson, Esq., M.P., D. C. Heron, Esq., M.P., Miss Gurney, Miss Le Geyt, Mr. A. Arnold, Mrs. Sims, Mrs. Buckton, Sir Harry Verney, M.P., Mrs. Lucas, Mrs. J. Stansfeld, Wm. Johnstone, Esq., M.P., Rev. Dr. Fraser, Mrs. Jacob Bright, Miss Tod, of Belfast; Lady Belcher, Rev. A. G. L'Estrange, Thos. Webster, Esq., W. H. Ashurst, Esq., Mrs. Sheldon Amos, Miss Wolsstenholme, Colonel and Mrs. Brine, W. D. Christie, Esq., C.B., J. Hopwood, Esq., James Hole, Esq., Sir John Murray, Lady Anna Gore Langton, Professor Newman, Mrs. Augusta Webster, Mr. Duncan M'Laren, M.P., Madame Venturi, Mrs. Thomas Taylor, Mrs. Fawcett, Mrs. Garrett Anderson, Rev. E. A. Fitzroy, Mrs. Lucas, Miss Hamilton, Mr. Hoskins, Miss Becker, Rev. B. Glover, Miss Crowe, Miss Stevenson, Miss Boucherett, Miss Downing, Col. Richardson Gardner, Mr. Stone, Mrs. Stansfeld, Lewis Moins, Esq., Mark Marsden, Esq., A. J. Williams, Esq., Miss C. A. Biggs, Mrs. Eastwick, etc.

The CHAIRMAN, after a few prefatory remarks, said this was the sixth anniversary of the great national movement for the promotion of women's suffrage, which began in 1867. It was his conviction that they had no reason to be dissatisfied with the progress they had made, or be doubtful of the ultimate result. One of the most common arguments that had been used by the opponents of the Bill which was now before the House had been cut from under their feet by the Ballot. (Cheers.) It used to be said, at every debate on this question, that the suffrage ought not to be conceded to women because it would expose them to all the uproar and disturbance attending a contested election. Uproar and disturbance on such occasions were things of the past, thanks to the passing of the Ballot Bill. He never himself thought there was anything in that argument, but it was necessary to lay some stress upon it, because the great leader of debate, Mr. Gladstone, thought so much of it that he suggested, as a means of avoiding the difficulty, the Italian plan of giving women votes by deputy. The next encouraging fact was what had taken place in connection with School Boards. Mrs. Grey, who was a candidate at the School Board, went down when hundreds and thousands of working men were hurrying to the hustings, and they stood aside for her to pass, and took off their hats as they gave her their cordial wishes and support. (Cheers.) Very gratifying was it to reflect upon the great success which had attended the efforts of ladies desiring to obtain seats on the School Boards. Eighteen ladies had been elected on the School Boards for Scotland. Another gratifying fact to be mentioned was that in the great public school at Harrow fifteen of the masters had signed a petition in favour of women's suffrage; and in the University of Cambridge a large proportion of the tutors had subscribed to it, including all the tutors of Trinity College. In the debate of 1871, Mr. Bouverie said that the desire for women's suffrage had died out in America; the right honourable gentleman's expression was, "The women's game is played out." (Laughter.) Was it played out? One of the articles of the convention which nominated General Grant especially called attention to the women's suffrage movement, and urged its great importance. The men who stood at the very summit

of literature and oratory in America supported the movement. Such as Ralph Waldo Emerson, Mr. Higginson, the essayist, Mr. Wendell Phillips, the great orator, and Judge Hoare. Mr. Emerson had said that the women's suffrage movement was an era in civilisation. In the great territory of Wyoming, which would, he hoped, become one of the states of the Union, the suffrage had long been given to women, and had been exercised by them most faithfully and successfully. Mr. John Stuart Mill, in the debate of 1867, said that if the law denied the vote to all but the possessors of £5,000 a year, the poorest men in the nation would now and then acquire the suffrage; but neither birth, nor fortune, nor merit, nor intellect, nor exertion could ever enable a woman's voice to be heard in the Parliament whose laws touched her interests as much as any in creation. (Cheers.) He (Mr. Eastwick) trusted those words would soon be applicable only to the past, and he earnestly appealed to the meeting to go on and maintain the struggle with the same moderation and patience that had characterised it hitherto, and which were the best guarantees of success. (Cheers.)

Mr. R. N. FOWLER, M.P., wished to say why, ever since he had had the honour of voting, he had voted in favour of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill. Sometimes it was said that the proposal was a great innovation in the institutions of the country; this was a proposition he utterly denied. The change, if change it were, had not been made recently, it was made by an Act which was passed as long ago as the year 1835; it was made by the Poor Law Act, under which ladies were allowed to vote in parochial elections, and he would challenge anyone to deny that the exercise of the franchise by ladies at such elections had not been attended with the greatest advantage to the administration of the great Act. We had therefore nearly 40 years' experience, and it had been an experience of a most satisfactory character. More recently we had the experience of the municipal elections, and the result had been equally satisfactory. Taking these facts into consideration it certainly was not now necessary to argue that the time had arrived for going a step further and applying the principle already conceded to Parliamentary elections. (Cheers.) He had not yet heard who was to lead the attack on Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill. On previous occasions it had been Mr. Bouverie, who upon this question had not acted consistently, with his own principles or the traditions of his family. The passing of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill he (Mr. Fowler) believed would be a general advantage to the country, and no sound or valid argument could be brought forward against it. The day could not be far distant when a general election would take place. It might be this year, or it might be next, but it could not be far distant. The friends of the woman's suffrage movement could not expect much from the present House of Commons, because, in view of its approaching dissolution, the votes were given more with reference to the hustings than anything else. The great fact to be borne in mind was that the country would soon be appealed to, and he would, therefore, entreat the ladies to use their influence, and the gentlemen to give their votes in favour of the candidates who would pledge themselves to support this great measure. (Cheers.) He moved:—"That to recognise sex as a ground of disqualification for voting in the election of members of Parliament is contrary to the principles of English representation, unjust to those excluded, and injurious to the whole community." (Cheers.)

Miss BECKER, in seconding this motion, said the arguments in favour of the principles it embodied had been so well and so often put before the country that very little more was now necessary for those who had been so long working for the cause than to give some account of the progress made. The



agitation had in fact progressed at a rate which could not be surpassed in the history of any other political movement. With but small means at its disposal, it had produced a great effect. Since September last upwards of 150 public meetings had been held in various parts of the country in support of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill. They had all been addressed by ladies, and at all of them resolutions had been passed in support of the Bill. Meetings had been held in Manchester, Liverpool, Bradford, Halifax, Huddersfield, Dewsbury, and Birmingham, and in every instance the verdict had been the same, namely a unanimous assent to the justice of the measure. Not only, however, had great public meetings so pronounced, but municipal councils had adopted petitions in favour of the principle. Upwards of 30 town councils had petitioned for the Bill, including such important bodies as the councils of Manchester, Edinburgh, Bath, Dewsbury, Middlesboro', and many other places. The members of these councils had had experience of Women's Suffrage in the election of those bodies, and had therefore recommended the Bill to the House of Commons. There had been in addition memorials to Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Disraeli, praying for their support to the principle of the Bill. They had been signed by upwards of 11,000 women; and it had been sought to have many places represented rather than many names from each place, and the memorials therefore represented a force of public opinion amongst women, which ought to have great weight with the gentlemen to whom they were addressed, and with the nation. (Cheers.) The question was felt by women who were working and thinking, to be one of deep practical earnestness. It was sometimes said that women had not sufficient political education to fit them for the franchise: she believed the amount of political education among women was greatly underrated by men, and that the political education of both men and women was not so good but that there was room for improvement. (Cheers.) But, whilst men had every opportunity of improving their political education, women by the fact of their political disabilities were debarred from much of this educational process. (Cheers.) Sometimes that objection might be made by men who did not think it a desirable thing that women should obtain political education or think intelligently on political matters. She had nothing to say about these, but to those who did believe that women ought to have an influence in the country, whether directly or indirectly, she would ask what opportunities women had of acquiring political education while they were shut out from a vote? (Cheers.) Political education amongst women must be acquired in the same way as amongst men, and when women had more political power there would arise leaders amongst them who would bring to bear upon political matters not only the intelligence which was common to all, but also opinions, especially advanced from a woman's point of view. It was natural that women should speak more effectually to women than men do, but in the present state of affairs the women who thought on political matters were in a manner compelled to be silent on public questions. Women of all shades of political opinion were seeking the franchise; but if any woman who was prominent in this question desired to give effect to her sentiments she was told she must not do so because the suffrage cause would be injured. On this account thoughtful women were compelled to hide their sentiments, lest it should injure the cause. This had had a disastrous effect upon the growth of political life. There were many social questions which were of deep interest to women, and upon which they held strong opinions; amongst others she might mention the Bill to render legal marriage with a deceased wife's sister. A great many women had petitioned for that Bill, as some had petitioned against it; but it was hardly possible for a woman to take an

active part on that Bill without giving offence to one or other among the Members of Parliament who are voting for the suffrage. She had even heard it said that certain members refused their support to women's suffrage, because women had petitioned against the Deceased Wife's Sister Marriage Bill. Such a state of things could not be favourable to a development of political opinions amongst women, and it was a strong reason for removing their disabilities. Again, it had been said that the possession of the suffrage would expose women to various corrupting political influences. That objection applied equally well, and with still greater force to the municipal franchise; municipal elections were very distinctly political, but the influences brought to bear upon municipal voters were mostly of the narrow, more degrading, and least elevating kind, whereas in Parliamentary elections we had something higher and broader. Under the existing state of things, therefore, women were exposed to the worst kind of political influence, and shut out from the higher influences of politics; and so long as women had the municipal and not the Parliamentary franchise they were at a disadvantage as compared to men. There was now a Bill before Parliament ostensibly to assimilate the municipal franchise in Ireland to that in England; yet the framer of the Bill had limited the franchise to men. She hoped their Parliamentary friends would take care that this omission was rectified, and that the women ratepayers of Ireland were allowed the same privileges as their sisters in England. (Cheers.) It was very striking to read in the debate on the Ballot Bill the extremely elaborate provisions made to secure the franchise to the illiterate voter. This was the cause of a feeling of shame to many intelligent women who, though admitted on the School Board, are excluded from the franchise where the poorest and most ignorant of men were admitted. In old times there was a law called benefit of clergy; reading was so rare an accomplishment that when a man possessed it he could not be hanged, and could save his life by reading a verse. (Laughter.) If something like the converse of that law were adopted among women, and the same provision were made to enable a woman to vote who could prove to the satisfaction of a returning officer she could read and write, the result would be gratifying. (Laughter and cheers.) Another objection was that the giving of a vote would involve women in considerable publicity and turmoil; but that objection was done away with by the granting of the School Board Franchise and the right of sitting on School Boards. The position of a voter in a constituency was not necessarily one of publicity at all. Any woman could go and give her vote under the Ballot Act with no more publicity than going to a place of amusement. The position of a candidate at a great popular election was, however, one of great publicity, and no persons could be elected on a School Board who did not make their views known to the electors, and in some degree become personally acquainted with the great body of the constituency. The constituency that elected the School Board of Manchester was one of the largest in the three kingdoms, and in that constituency women were invited to become candidates; and it was perfectly ridiculous to say that women might do this and yet not be permitted to give a vote for the Parliamentary Members for Manchester. (Cheers.) As to the reluctance which some professed to feel at involving women in the excitement of political discussion, they were already involved in it by the elections to which she had referred; for there was no branch of politics which involved more fierce discussions than that in which the politico-theological element entered, as at School Boards, and to the full force of which women were exposed. It was surprising that the House of Commons should refuse women this vote. In spite of what the hon. member who preceded her had said, she confessed to

being one of those who did expect something even from it, for she expected something like logical consistency in the arguments it brought forward. (Cheers.) And she did not see with what consistency the House of Commons could give women as much as it had given and withhold the rest. She had some faith in the logic of men—at least they were very fond of telling us they were guided solely by logic and reason, and not by emotion or prejudice. (Laughter.) The present was a peculiarly fitting time for passing Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill. We were on the eve of a general election. In the earlier years of the present Parliament it was urged as an objection to the passing of the Bill that the addition of so large a body to the constituency would require that Parliament should be dissolved in order that the opinion of the new constituency might be taken. Now, then was the opportunity; before appealing to the country let this new constituency be admitted, and then the next Parliament would represent a very much wider body of opinion. (Cheers.) She would not say that the return of any member to the House of Commons would be influenced by the vote he gave on this question, and she felt very certain that no member would lose a single vote in consequence of having given a vote for this measure of justice. (Cheers.) There was in Lancashire a short time ago an election in a large constituency. There were two candidates before the electors—Conservative and Liberal—and both were questioned as to whether they would, if returned, support Mr. Bright's Bill. The Conservative unhesitatingly replied that he would vote for the Bill; the Liberal returned an evasive answer. A Liberal elector said that ever since he lived in the constituency he had voted Liberal, but if the Liberal candidate did not promise to vote for Mr. Bright's Bill he would vote for the Tory, and there were six or seven others whose votes would follow his. (Cheers.) Now, she did not wish to threaten members. (Laughter.) She would appeal to their sense of justice and right, at the same time reminding them that they might conciliate a great deal of kind feeling amongst the women of their constituencies by voting for this Bill. She for one never believed that any men deliberately intended to do any kind of injustice or wrong to women. If the wrong was done it was through ignorance. Men tried to do what they thought good for women; but women were now beginning to ask that their own voices might be heard in the matter. Finally, she would say that this women's suffrage movement did not proceed from any kind of antagonism or rivalry with men; it proceeded, on the contrary, from the deepest and truest sympathy in their highest hopes and aspirations. (Cheers.)

Miss RHODA GARRETT supported the resolution.

A gentleman, who gave the name of BAZALGETTE, moved an amendment, the effect of which was that it is contrary to the interests of the State and woman herself that she should be admitted to any share in politics. A young lady in the body of the meeting was understood to second the amendment, which was supported by Mr. MASON JONES. The meeting having heard the discussion on this with considerable impatience, rejected the amendment by an overwhelming majority.

Lady ANNA GORE-LANGTON said: It seems to me, that on this subject, the removal of the political disabilities of women, there exists some misapprehension. When it is mentioned in society, its promoters are accused of wishing to revolutionise domestic life, by setting women in authority over men. This is quite a mistake; we have no such intention. It would be folly, and would make women ridiculous. Speaking for women, I say that we have far too great respect for our husbands and fathers, to wish for an instant, if even such a thing were possible, to deprive them of the headship of their families which God has given them. Happy wedded life,

where husband and wife mutually aid each other, and share each other's interests and pursuits, is the greatest of earthly blessings, and is far too sacred to be interfered with. But such happiness is not intended for all. We do not ask for the franchise for young girls, or for wives whose hearts and whose hands are filled with domestic duties; but for those women who have the qualification which is required of men. Many circumstances of late years have combined to bring forward this claim. The spread of education and of cheap literature—the quicker circulation of ideas—the more active political life of men, consequent on the lowering of the franchise, which has brought political discussions into the sphere of many more homes—the rapid increase of the population—above all, the surplus of women, who in 1861 were nearly a million in excess of the men—this has obliged many more women to work for their own support. In 1861 there were between two and three millions of women working for wages, or possessed of independent means, and since then the number must have increased. These women contribute by their industry to the well-being of the country; they are taxed the same as men, submit to the same laws. Is it just they should not have the same privileges? In the beginning of the last century, a legal authority said he conceived "that giving a vote for a representative in Parliament is the privilege by which every Englishman protects his property, and that whoever deprives him of such vote deprives him of his birthright." Englishwomen possess property, how are they to protect it? In old days, when might was right, women for the sake of protection were married very early in life, or consigned to the cloister. Even then, under certain circumstances, they were allowed to choose a champion to fight for them. In these days, when law is paramount, there seems nothing unfeminine in giving a vote for a representative in Parliament. The Ballot Bill has made elections more orderly, and therefore facilitates women voting; but if men dislike seeing their faces at the polling booth, why not allow women voting papers, such as are used at the University elections; they can be sent by post. When women set to work in various ways they are confronted by a kind of trades union among men which tends to lower their wages, and keeps them out of many fitting and remunerative employments. When they examine the laws peculiarly affecting their sex, their property, and their children, they find them partial, one-sided, and more in favour of the men than they would be if the opinion of women was also consulted. Only a few weeks ago, a Bill passed through the House of Commons, though it did not become law, which was entirely one-sided, for while it permitted a man to marry his sister-in-law, it did not permit a woman to marry her brother-in-law. Was that fair? The consequences of any alteration of the marriage law would be so serious to women, that surely none such ought to be made, unless their free and independent opinion on the subject can be arrived at, and that can only be done by giving them the franchise. The objection is made that if women vote they must also sit in Parliament. That is not a necessary consequence. Formerly women voted for directors of the East India Company, as they now vote for railway directors; but we have not yet heard of a woman becoming a director. Besides, clergymen have the franchise, but are prevented by special Act of Parliament from sitting in the House of Commons. Women are now trying to improve their position by obtaining juster laws for their sex, better education, and the removal of many impediments to their work. They are trying by perfectly legitimate means to use that influence which they are said to possess to so great an extent, and of which men seem so fearful, to obtain what is now the dearest wish of many a female heart—the political franchise. Is not this a higher, nobler aim than amusement,



dress, or finery? These latter men give them to any extent, even to their ruin. Time will show if they will help them to their higher aims. I quite allow there are many women happy in quiet, domestic life, amply provided and cared for, who say they do not want a vote, for it would be rather a trouble. They are quite content with their position; and so they ought to be, and long may they continue so. They have everything to make life easy and comfortable. But generous and liberal-minded women will allow that charity does not consist solely in almsgiving. There is a feeling—sympathy—by which we understand each other's hearts; it does more to bind us together, and to smooth away the distinction of classes, than even the giving of gold. Let us exercise that feeling, and imagine ourselves in the position of our less fortunate sisters, who are toiling on amid difficulties and temptations alone and unaided. In a short time, I think, many will then agree with the opinion I have long held, that in reason and in justice those women who have the required qualification ought to have the political franchise. I, therefore, move the second resolution, "That this meeting approves of the Bill entitled a Bill to Remove the Electoral Disabilities of Women, and authorises its chairman to sign petitions in its favour to both Houses of Parliament."

Mr. HERON, M.P., seconded the motion. He had always been of opinion that the argument as regarded the property qualification in connection with this question was unanswerable, and that when a woman, either by the descent of property or by hard, earnest, and laborious work in the world, under difficulties and disadvantages that men could not dream of, had acquired property it should entitle her to the franchise in the same way in which it would entitle the possessor to a vote if he were a man. He never could understand the argument which would deprive her of it, unless she was, in the language of the opponents of the movement, physically unfit to exercise that very low privilege, the electoral franchise. By what was called the logical argument, it was said that women were the creatures of impulse and passion, and that they were unable to understand the bearing of any logical argument. But if we were to go to logic and make that a test of the electoral qualification, who was there fit to vote, or even to be a member of Parliament? (Laughter.) There had been women, from Mary Wolstencroft downwards, who had been distinguished not merely as creatures of impulse and passion, but as powerful writers, clear and logical thinkers, able to express their opinions upon every subject as well as most men, and better than many. He would ask any opponent why on earth a woman should be deprived of the property qualification for the franchise? Women were allowed to exercise the municipal franchise, and in that way to influence the property of important cities; women not only voted, but sat on the School Boards, and had proved to be not the least influential, and certainly not amongst the worst members of the School Boards. (Laughter and cheers.) In the House of Commons there was an argument known as the pedestal argument: people said women ought to be placed upon so lofty a pedestal as never to be degraded so as to walk through the mire of a contested election—(laughter)—they must be put aloft to be admired, but must never exercise the rights and privileges of a free and free thinking British subject. The pedestal argument, however, had been very nearly exploded, because the gentlemen who used it never reflected, or, if they did think, put the thought aside, that while they said women should be placed upon a lofty pedestal politically, yet as regarded the ordinary daily life there was no domestic drudgery too severe, no work too hard for women. A favourite argument with opponents of this measure was that men were sent to fight and bear the

hard burdens which the State imposed, and that women were exempt from them. He would ask that appeal to the common sense of the meeting whether in a great struggle affecting great nations the women did not suffer as much, nay ten times more than the men. (Cheers.) The mere excitement of battle was nothing compared to the prolonged agony of those at home. In Paris, while the men in the field were receiving their daily rations, in the garrets and cellars of the besieged city the women were perishing of famine. Was not the name of Florence Nightingale embalmed in history as an answer to this peace and war question so often heard. (Cheers.) In every relation of life that he could discover, both as regarded their conduct and judgment, women, if admitted to the franchise, would be amongst the best electors of the British Empire. It was often said that most women were Conservative in politics. He said, if they desire to be Conservative let them, and if they choose to be Liberals let them. (Laughter.) He hoped it was not necessary to spend much time in proving to the meeting that there was no such very tremendous danger to the British Constitution if the few women who, by the descent of property or industry were entitled to the franchise, were allowed to exercise it, even though it involved walking through the mire of a contested election. And he would remind those who were continually speaking of the dangers of a contested election, that we had got rid of a great deal of the excitement and annoyance of the nomination and polling day by the beneficent operations of the Ballot, and there were now none of the scenes which of old discountenanced women from going to the polling booth. (Cheers.)

Miss BEEDY supported the resolution.

Mr. W. JOHNSTON, M.P., supported the resolution briefly. He recommended the supporters of the measure before Parliament to prosecute their movement until what they required was given. He referred to the observations of Miss Becker as to the defect in the Bill which she had mentioned, and he would take care, when the proper time arrived, to move an amendment that would give Irishwomen the same privileges as Englishwomen enjoyed. (Cheers.)

The resolution was carried with acclamation.

Miss STURGE proposed the third resolution, viz.: "That this meeting expresses its best thanks to those Members of Parliament who have voted in favour of the Bill to Remove the Electoral Disabilities of Women, and hopes they will again support the measure when brought forward on Wednesday next." She always, she said, felt the poverty of language when she wished to move with any force a vote of thanks, and she was especially anxious that the present vote should be a cordial one. She wished as forcibly as she could to express her thanks to the gentlemen who had had the courage for so many sessions of Parliament to be in a minority. It did require courage to occupy that position, and perhaps it would require still more courage to openly change your opinions. She hoped we should find the members who had already voted for this measure, which she so firmly believed was for the benefit of the community, would every one of them record their votes in its favour; she hoped the majority would have the courage to change their opinions, that she might be able to include them in the vote of thanks next time. (Laughter.) Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen last year spoke of the clouded existence of man, and she imagined it was in consequence of that cloud in which the majority of them had hitherto been involved that they were unable to see the question of Women's Suffrage as she would wish them to see it. (Laughter.) One of the gentlemen who had spoken upon the amendment which the meeting had rejected had gone back for an argument as far as Adam and Eve, perhaps she might have recourse to

her Quaker theology and quote the words of George Fox, who on one occasion, when some one wrote to him about the preaching of women, replied that before the fall Eve was equal to Adam, and that the New Testament restored that equality. (Cheers.) She had heard it said that women ought not to be entrusted with a vote, because they were liable to panic; but the conduct of certain opponents of the measure convinced her that panic was not confined to women. She assured the gentleman who had moved the amendment that there was no reason why they should be alarmed. Capacity, she believed, would find its own level anywhere; capacity was a divine law, and that man had little faith who fancied that God's law required bolstering up by the laws of man. (Cheers.) She would remind her hearers that progression was often liable to contract experience. A gentleman once told her that it was quite clear that it was not intended that women should speak in public because of their voice. That was absurd, for Mr. Glaisher had stated that in a balloon a man's voice could be heard a mile, a woman's could be heard two miles. (Loud laughter.) One was continually hearing what had been termed the peace and war argument. It might be true that women could not go out as soldiers, but this was an argument that always reminded her that Dr. Watts, who was no mean authority, wished to confine fighting to dogs. (Renewed laughter.) She claimed the vote for women householders, who were paying their rates and taxes, on the ground of our common humanity. It all just came to this—either men were infallible or women had no souls. (Loud laughter.) At an old French Council in the thirteenth century the question was discussed whether women had souls, and it was carried by a majority of one. (Laughter.) The same question in a different form would come before Parliament when Mr. Jacob Bright introduced his Bill. (Cheers.) What had hitherto been the majority might again affirm their own infallibility, and at the same time deny that women had mind and soul. She would remind them of this council of the 13th century which affirmed it by a majority of one; surely the present House of Commons might do as much for us as the French Council did for the women of the thirteenth century. (Laughter.) Liberty of conscience was a mockery without liberty of action; and women ought to be allowed the latter—allowed to act for the best according to their capacity. A gentleman wrote to her not long ago that he objected to women's suffrage because it would increase the power of priestcraft. Surely if a man's sense of right was to override a woman's sense of right that was mancraft and priestcraft too. She cared little for the sentimental pedestalism which was given to ladies, because it was generally taken from the level of womanhood to give to ladyism. (Cheers.)

Mr. ASHURST seconded the resolution. He referred to the official appointment given to Mrs. Nassau Senior, and said he was able to inform the meeting, on the best authority, that she did her work as well as any of her male competitors could do it. (Cheers.)

The resolution was then carried unanimously, and on the proposition of Mrs. ARTHUR ARNOLD, seconded by Mrs. BUXTON, a vote of thanks was passed to the chairman.—This compliment Mr. EASTWICK briefly acknowledged, after which the meeting closed.

#### EDGWARE.

On April the 3rd a public meeting was held in the Goods Shed, Edgware, in support of the Women's Suffrage Bill. There was a large attendance, and the chair was occupied by Edward W. Cox, Esq., serjeant-at-law. There were on the platform Mrs. H. Kingsley, Mrs. G. Sims, Miss H. Downing, C. J. Plumtre, Esq., and H. J. Hunter, Esq.—A resolution

affirming the principle was moved by Mrs. H. Kingsley and seconded by Mr. H. J. Hunter, and supported by Mrs. G. Sims.—A man who sat among the audience here made a remark, when the Chairman asked him to go on the platform, which he did, and said his name was Mr. Bakewell. He then made some rather lengthy remarks in opposition to the question before the meeting. He wished to protect women, but not to give them the same privileges as men. (Oh, oh!) He did not consider women equal to men, but their superiors—in a poetical sense. (Oh, oh! and laughter.)—The resolution was then carried.—Mr. C. J. Plumtre moved the adoption of the petition.—Miss H. Downing seconded the resolution, which was carried; and after a vote of thanks to the Chairman the meeting dispersed.

#### HAMPSTEAD.

A well attended and enthusiastic meeting, convened by the London National Society for Women's Suffrage, was held at Hampstead on Thursday evening, the 27th instant, under the presidency of Dr. Lankester, the coroner for Central Middlesex, and the usual resolutions claiming for women householders equal parliamentary representation with men were unanimously passed. The speakers were—Mrs. William Burbury, Mr. Frederick Hill, Mr. Lucraft, Mr. A. W. Bennett, Mrs. John Hullah, Mr. J. H. Levy, Miss Lord, and Mr. Adolphe Smith.

#### WIMBLEDON.

A meeting was held, on March 27th, in the Lecture Hall, Wimbledon, Mr. C. R. Greenside in the chair. A resolution in favour of the principle was moved by Miss Rhoda Garrett, and seconded by Mr. Arthur Arnold. Mr. N. Bazalette rose and moved an amendment negating the resolution. This was seconded by a gentleman whose name did not transpire. Mrs. Rose moved the second resolution, which was seconded by Miss Beedy, and was supported by Mr. Graves. The chairman then, amid some excitement, put the resolutions *en masse* to the meeting, and declared that the noes had it. A vote of thanks to the chairman concluded the proceedings.

#### CHELSEA.

A public meeting was held on April 10th, in the large hall of the Eleusis Club, King's Road, Chelsea, Mr. W. Harry in the chair. The meeting was addressed by Mrs. Geo. Sims, Mr. Levy, Miss Downing, Mr. Fred. Harcastle, Mrs. John Hullah, Mr. Wm. Pennack, and resolutions and petitions in favour of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill were carried unanimously. Votes of thanks to the ladies and the chairman concluded the proceedings.

#### PECKHAM.

On March 28th a public meeting, convened by the London National Society for Women's Suffrage, was held in the Rosemary Branch Assembly Rooms, Peckham. The chair was taken by Mr. John Andrew Lyon, who was supported by Miss M. E. Beedy, M.A., Mrs. William Burbury, honorary secretary of the society; Mr. J. T. Dexter, the Rev. Isaac Dosey, Mr. R. D. Hilton, Mrs. John Hullah, Mr. Frederick Kent, Miss Lord, Mr. and Mrs. Adolphe Smith, Mr. and Mrs. William Webster, and several other ladies and gentlemen. The usual resolutions were supported by Mrs. John Hullah, Mr. Fredk. Kent, Mr. Webster, Miss Beedy, Mr. R. D. Hilton, Rev. Isaac Dosey, Mr. Adolphe Smith, and Mr. Churchwarden Turney, and carried with one or two dissentients. A vote of thanks to the chairman, moved by Mr. J. T. Dexter, seconded by Mr. R. Strong, J.P., brought the proceedings to a close.



## ISLINGTON.

A meeting was held on Feb. 24th at Myddelton Hall, Islington; the Rev. Dr. Binney occupied the chair. There were about 400 persons present. The first resolution was moved and supported by Mrs. P. A. Taylor, Miss Rhoda Garrett, Mrs. John Hullah, and carried with about 10 dissentients. A resolution, adopting a petition, was moved by Mrs. Henry Kingsley, seconded by Miss Downing, and carried with three dissentients. A vote of thanks to the chairman, moved by Miss Garrett and seconded by the Rev. Dr. Raleigh, who said that he sympathised with the movement, brought the proceedings to a close.

## NORTHAMPTON.

A crowded and influential public meeting was held on Thursday, April 24th, in the Town Hall, which was kindly lent by the Mayor. Mr. Alderman Manfield occupied the chair, and the speakers were accompanied on the platform by W. Shoosmith, Esq., the Town Clerk, Mrs. Manfield, Miss Mylne, Mr. H. Harris, and a numerous party of ladies and gentlemen. A resolution affirming the principle of the Women's Disabilities Bill was proposed by Mr. Councillor Gurney in a short speech, and was seconded by Mr. Samuel Mason. Miss Mary Beedy, M.A., and Miss C. A. Biggs supported the resolution, which was carried unanimously. Mr. Councillor P. P. Perry, J.P., moved that the chairman should sign a petition for the meeting in favour of the Bill, and the Rev. T. Arnold seconded it. The motion was carried. The Rev. T. Adams from Daventry, next proposed the usual vote of thanks, which was seconded by Mr. James Wells, and on the motion of Miss Beedy a vote of thanks was added to the Mayor for his kindness in allowing the use of the hall, and carried with enthusiasm. After the usual thanks to the Chairman the meeting dispersed.

## NORWICH.

A public meeting was held on April 18th, at Mr. Noverre's Room, Norwich—Mr. A. M. F. Morgan in the chair, in advocacy of the movement which has for its object the extension of the suffrage to women. Two ladies of the National Society for Women's Suffrage, Miss E. Beedy and Miss Caroline Biggs, addressed the meeting in very forcible speeches, arguing that as property was the only basis of representation in England, women who possessed property should not be deprived of their representation on account of their sex; that as women householders had been admitted to the exercise of the municipal franchise, their admission to the Parliamentary franchise was but a logical consequence; and that as women were hardly treated by many of the existing laws, and as there were many cases in which they directly suffered through having no voice in the election of legislators, it was expedient the suffrage should be extended to them. On the motion of Mr. J. D. Smith, seconded by Miss Biggs, resolutions affirming the principle and adopting petitions and memorials to the county and borough members were carried with only one dissentient.

## BURY ST. EDMUND'S.

A public meeting, attended by between 400 and 500 persons, was held in the Town Hall, on Monday, April 21st. Dr. Christian presided, and the meeting was also addressed by Miss Helena P. Downing, and Miss Beedy. The resolution moved by Miss Beedy, expressing approval of the Women's Disabilities Removal Bill, and requesting the borough and county members to support it, was seconded by a gentleman in the body of the hall, and was carried unanimously.

## LIVERPOOL.

A public meeting was held on April 3rd, at Hope Hall, Liverpool. The large hall was crowded before the proceedings commenced, many ladies being among the audience. Dr. Townson presided, and among those present were:—Miss Becker, Miss Beedy, M.A., Mrs. M'Taggart, Miss Attwood, Madame Marriet, Mrs. C. Miller, Mrs. R. T. Yates, Miss Meade King, Mrs. Daniel Rea, Mrs. Josephine Butler, Rev. W. Binns, Dr. Towson, Dr. Hitchman, Dr. Burrows, Messrs. H. W. Meade King, Miller, J. Snape, R. Rea, T. Pritchard, W. Burgess, C. J. English, Alfred Holt, Golding, Richard Lloyd, Horsfall, Underhill, and Stubbs. The Chairman said he thought that woman had not hitherto occupied the position which she was entitled to occupy, and he was there to assist, so far as he could, to raise women to the position, socially and politically, to which they were entitled. There had been a great amount of prejudice raised upon this question; but he hoped that it was passing away. Let them consider these prejudices, and see whether or not they were called upon to take a step now which would advance women into the position they were entitled to fill. (Applause.) The Rev. W. Binns proposed the first resolution, which was seconded by Dr. Burrows, and supported by Miss Beedy. On being put to the meeting, the resolution was carried by an overwhelming majority, only four or five hands being held up against it. The second resolution adopting petitions and memorials in favour of the Women's Disabilities Bill was proposed by Mr. J. Snape, seconded by Madame Marriet, and supported by Miss Becker. It was carried almost unanimously. Mr. Meade King moved a vote of thanks to the ladies who had addressed the meeting, and after the vote had been acknowledged by Miss Beedy and Miss Becker, a vote of thanks to the chairman concluded the proceedings.

## BRIGHTON.

A meeting was held in the Town Hall, Brighton, on April 26th. The Mayor (Mr. Alderman Ireland) presided, and on the platform were Lord Campbell and Stratheden, the Rev. J. M. Fincher, Mr. Arthur Arnold and Mrs. Arnold, Mr. John Robertson and Mrs. Robertson, Mrs. Haycroft, Mr. Shirley Woolmer, Mr. F. Merrifield, &c. It should be mentioned that Lord Campbell and Stratheden was to have addressed the meeting, but unfortunately was unable to do so, arriving from London late, and having to leave early to catch a train. The usual resolutions were proposed and supported by the above-named ladies and gentlemen and carried unanimously, and after a vote of thanks to the Mayor the meeting separated.

## NORTH BOW.

A public meeting was held on April 24th, in the North Bow Mission Church, Mr. William Halls in the chair. A paper was read by Miss Fenwick Miller, after which a petition in favour of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill was adopted with one dissentient.

## CHELSEA.

A public meeting, convened by the London National Society for Women's Suffrage, was held on April 23rd in the Chelsea Vestry Hall, W. D. Christie, Esq., C. B. presiding. The first resolution: "That in a system of government avowedly representative, the interests of an unrepresented class are certain to suffer," was proposed by Miss Beedy in a very forcible and logical speech. The meeting was also addressed by Mrs. John Hullah, Mr. Shipton, Mr. J. Lowry Whittle, Mr. J. H. Levy, and Mr. Nicass, and all the resolutions were carried unanimously. Votes of thanks to the Chairman and to the Chelsea Vestry closed the proceedings.

## SCOTLAND.

## COLDSTREAM.

On February 26th, Miss Craigen held a meeting in the Mechanics' Hall, Coldstream. The meeting was well attended, and a petition in favour of the Bill was adopted and forwarded to Mr. D. Robertson, M.P.

## GLASGOW.

A meeting, addressed by Miss Craigen, was held on March 14th, in the Templars' Hall, Blackfriars-street, Glasgow, when a petition was adopted in favour of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill.

## DUNFERMLINE.

On March 25th, a meeting was held in the Music Hall, Dunfermline. Well attended and very successful in point of sympathy. The vote for the petition was carried unanimously.

## INVERKEITHING.

A meeting was held in the Music Hall, Inverkeithing, on March 27th. There was a small attendance. Miss Craigen addressed the meeting, and petitions were signed in favour of the Bill.

## KILSYTH.

Miss Craigen lectured on April 1st at a meeting in the Court House, Kilsyth, Stirlingshire. There was a very full attendance. It had been rumoured that a gentleman intended to oppose the lecturer, and the prospect of a discussion attracted many. When the lecture was concluded there were repeated calls for the opponent, but he did not appear, and the petition was carried by acclamation.

## PORT BANNATYNE, BUTESHIRE.

On April 4th Miss Craigen held a meeting in the Free Church Schoolroom, Port Bannatyne. There was a large attendance, and petitions and memorials were signed with only one hand held up to the contrary.

## ALLOA.

In April, Miss Taylour delivered a lecture in the Corn Exchange, Alloa. There was a good audience, and perhaps the majority were ladies. The meeting was opened with prayer, after which the Rev. Mr. McDowall, who presided, introduced the lecturer. Resolutions in support of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill were moved and supported by Mr. John Minn, Mr. Thomas Stirling, Mr. Forester Paton, and the Rev. Mr. Matheson, and carried without dissent.

## KIRKCALDY.

A public meeting in favour of women's suffrage was held in Rose Street Chapel, Kirkcaldy, on April 15th, to hear an address from Miss Taylour, of Belmont. There was a fair attendance, and Mr. Robert Douglas was called to the chair. Miss Taylour was accompanied on this occasion by Miss Burton, sister of John Hill Burton, the historian. After the address Mr. John Lockhart moved, and Mr. Macpherson seconded the adoption of a petition in favour of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill, which was carried unanimously.—Miss Hill Burton moved a cordial vote of thanks to Mr. Douglas for presiding, and took advantage of the opportunity to urge upon women the necessity of their taking a deeper interest in the cause.

In addition to the above, Miss Taylour has held meetings at ANSTRUTHER, CUPAR, INVERKEITHING, DOLLAR, BATHGATE, and DUNFERMLINE, and Miss Craigen at DUNOON, and KERRIEMUIR, at all of which meetings petitions have been adopted in favour of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill.

## THE PROPERTY OF MARRIED WOMEN.

The Married Women's Property Act Amendment Bill, introduced by Mr. Hinde Palmer, has gone into Committee of the House of Commons, but no one can form a conjecture as to when it is likely to emerge from that stage of the proceedings. Despite the assurance of so many honourable members who voted against giving to women any share in political power, that the House was always ready to do justice in legislating for them—we have to record the fact that four times within the past few weeks the House has been counted out when the Married Women's Property Act came on, and that the apathy and indifference of members to measures designed to redress the grievances of women, seems to offer an insuperable bar to their progress. There have been this session 240 petitions, with 32,016 signatures, presented in favour of this Bill, and not one against it.

## PETITIONS FOR THE WOMEN'S DISABILITIES BILL.

We are compelled to postpone the detailed list of petitions presented since our last issue, but we append the summary of those presented up to April 29, taken from the fourteenth Parliamentary report:—

	No. of Petitions signed Officially or under Seal.	Total No. of Petitions.	Total No. of Signatures.
Women's Disabilities Bill—In favour	160	841	276,715

## COMMITTEES.

## LUTON.

Mrs. Bigg	Mrs. G. Elliott
Miss Stormer	Mrs. Williams
Mrs. Mayles	Mrs. Webb
Miss Bigg	Mrs. Hooker
Mrs. S. Jones	Miss Hooker
Mrs. Webster	

Mrs. Wright, St. John's College, *Hon. Secretary.*

## DOVER.

Miss Dunbar, 3, Clarence Place, has been appointed treasurer to the Dover committee.

## Obituary.

THE VEN. ARCHDEACON SANDFORD.—We regret to record the death of Archdeacon Sandford, which took place on March 22, on his 72nd birthday. He was the son of Bishop Sandford, of Edinburgh. He obtained first-class in classics at Oxford; was admitted member of Balliol College in 1824; received the title of B.D. in 1846; was appointed to the canonry of Westminster in 1851. He was Archdeacon of Coventry, and Rector of Alvechurch, in Worcestershire. He took part in the first public meeting held in Manchester in support of Women's Suffrage, in 1868, and afterwards attended one having the same object at Birmingham. He was distinguished for his support of efforts designed to improve the social and domestic condition of the people.

L'AVENIR DES FEMMES. Edited by M. Leon Richer. The only Journal on the continent of Europe exclusively devoted to the study and the discussions of feminine interests. Published fortnightly. Subscriptions for England, 12s. 6d. annually, payable in advance. Orders and remittances may be transmitted through Miss Becker, office of the *Women's Suffrage Journal*, 28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester.



## MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL.

At an adjourned special meeting of the Manchester City Council held on April 16th; the Mayor (Mr. W. Booth) in the chair, Mr. Alderman BENNETT, in accordance with a notice of motion which has been on the agenda paper of the Council for two successive meetings, moved to petition Parliament in favour of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill to Remove the Electoral Disabilities of Women.

Mr. BAKER seconded the motion, which was supported by Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT.

Mr. Alderman LAMB said he rose once more to oppose the annual motion of Mr. Alderman Bennett. Judging from the results of the extension of the municipal suffrage to women, he should say that it was precisely the class of women who were the most fitted to exercise the vote that never troubled themselves about it. He had presided at municipal elections, and had observed that the majority of women who voted were the least influential and the worst educated class. ("Hear, hear," and "No, no.") Well, that was his experience. Men brought these women up to the polling place, and their lessons were so badly learned in many instances that the name of the candidate for whom they desired to vote had been forgotten before they came to the polling booth.

Mr. Alderman MURRAY moved, as an amendment upon Mr. Alderman Bennett's motion:—"That, without expressing any opinion upon the abstract question referred to in the resolution now proposed, this Council declines to be the medium for promoting the objects of any political association, as being foreign to its legitimate functions, and sanctioning a practice which might be found to be inconvenient and objectionable."

Mr. CROSTON seconded the amendment.

Mr. NIELD, who rose amid cries of "Vote," said that, having been a returning officer at the most recent election in the district in which Mr. Alderman Lamb took special interest, he must say that, as far as his experience went, it appeared to him to be a most orderly election, and the ladies who took part in it were specially distinguished for their aptitude and evident knowledge of what they were doing. The only case of drunkenness that came under his observation on the occasion was on the part of a man. The only case of inability to state the name of the candidate for whom a vote was tendered was the case of a man.

Mr. W. G. BENNETT also said that he could not allow Mr. Alderman Lamb's statements to go uncontradicted. He knew a good deal about municipal elections, both as a principal and as a worker, and he said freely that, if there was any difference between the male and female voters, so far as their conduct was concerned, the females were the more orderly and well-behaved.

Mr. MARK PRICE also spoke in support of the resolution.

After some remarks by Mr. Alderman BENNETT,

The Council divided, when there voted—

For Mr. Alderman Bennett's motion—Mr. Alderman Bennett, Mr. Baker, Mr. W. G. Bennett, Mr. Alderman Brougham, Mr. J. S. Brown, Mr. W. Brown, Mr. S. Dyson, Mr. P. Goldschmidt, Mr. Greenwood, Mr. Griffin, Mr. J. J. Harwood, Mr. Alderman Heywood, Mr. W. Hodgkinson, Mr. E. Holt, Mr. R. Hope, Mr. Alderman Hopkinson, Mr. S. Ingham, Mr. George Lee, Mr. W. Mather, Mr. T. Muirhead, Mr. Joseph Nield, Mr. T. Potts, Mr. Mark Price, Mr. J. F. Roberts, Mr. H. Shaw, Mr. Walton Smith, Mr. J. Townsend, Mr. R. T. Walker, Mr. J. Waterhouse, Mr. J. W. Whittaker, Mr. Alderman Willert, Mr. Worthington—32.

For the amendment—Mr. J. Ashton, Mr. Alderman Baker, Mr. W. Batty, the Mayor, Mr. Croston, Mr. Eastwood, Mr. Alderman Grundy, Mr. Hampson, Mr. Alderman King, Mr. Alderman Lamb, Mr. Alderman Murray, Mr. Alderman Nicholls, Mr. Alderman Patteson, Mr. T. Schofield, Mr. Adam Woodward—14.

## BATH TOWN COUNCIL.

## IMPORTANT DEBATE ON WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

A special meeting of the Town Council was held on March 27th ostensibly for the purpose of considering certain questions of political bearings, which a resolution, passed by the Town Council some years since, debar the corporation from discussing, except in a meeting specially convened to that end. Among the questions ostracised, so to speak, at the last meeting was that all-important one at the present day, "The Electoral Disabilities of Women." The advocates of "Women's Rights" in the council would not allow it to be permanently shelved, and hence the meeting on Thursday. In the absence of the Mayor Alderman Gill was voted to the chair. There were also present—Aldermen Hooper, Hunt, Gill, Gore, Jolly, and Moger; Councillors Heywood, Lester, Robertson, Harding, Turner, Taylor, Broadley, Freeman, White, Brickmann, Bright, Eckley, Whatley, Falkner, B. Bartrum, Savage, Shum, Milsom, Simmons, Clark, Morris, Lewis, Hulbert, Oliver, Marshall, Whitfield, Wadham, and J. S. Bartrum.

The discussion on this subject was introduced by Alderman HUNT, who, in the course of his remarks, said that the question had already been before a public meeting of his fellow-citizens, and was very favourably received. Encouraging as that meeting was in favour of women's suffrage, the ladies who were promoting the measure in the city were exceedingly anxious to enlist the Town Council in their behalf, well knowing that as municipal representatives their opinion must have weight both with the public and the legislature. He moved that they should petition the House of Commons in favour of Mr. Bright's Bill for the Removal of the Political Disabilities of Women.

Mr. ROBERTSON, in seconding the resolution, said the question might be a political one, but he could not conceive how it could be termed a party question. It had been introduced into the House by such eminent Liberals as Mr. Fawcett and Mr. Bright; while on the other hand it had been supported by eminent Conservatives, among whom was Mr. Disraeli. If public questions such as this were excluded from the Council they would be making a great mistake. Every one knew that the tendency of the present age was to centralise; and who could tell how the old principle of local self-government might be invaded? (Hear, hear.)

Mr. LEWIS rose to move an amendment.—"That the Council, without expressing any opinion on the propriety of the measure in question, deem it not advisable to entertain matters of such a political character, and not especially affecting the municipal government of the city and borough."

Mr. BRIGHT seconded the amendment.

Alderman GORE opposed it. By granting the franchise to women they would be performing an act of justice by removing disqualifications intrinsically unjust. They had survived the days of disqualifications, and it was a recognised fact that the political and constitutional health of the country had benefitted by it.

Mr. HEYWOOD contended that the question was as much Liberal as Conservative. He simply maintained that women who undertook men's responsibilities, burdens, and labours, had a right to be represented, and he hoped when they got the franchise they would use it properly. He had great hopes that they would.

The motion was further supported by Mr. HULBERT, Major-General TURNER, and Mr. WHITE, and opposed by Alderman JOLLY.

The Council soon afterwards divided; 15 voted for Mr. Lewis's amendment, and 22 against it.

Mr. Hunt's resolution was therefore carried by a majority.

## THE MUTINY ACTS OF 1873.

The Committee of the Vigilance Association desire to call the attention of their friends to the following report of the proceedings in connection with the passing of the above-named measure.

The fortieth section of the Mutiny Act of previous years reads as follows:—"No soldier or other person, as aforesaid, shall be liable by any process whatever to appear before any justice of the peace, or other authority whatever, or to be taken out of Her Majesty's service by any writ, summons, warrant, order, judgment, execution, or any process whatsoever, issued to or by the authority of any court of law, or any magistrate, justice, or justices of the peace, or any other authority whatsoever, for any original debt not amounting to thirty pounds, or for not supporting or maintaining, or for not having supported or maintained, or for leaving, or having left, chargeable to any parish, township, or place, or to the common fund of any Union, any relation\* or child which such soldier or person might, if not in Her Majesty's service, be compelled by law to relieve or maintain, or for neglecting to pay to the mother of any bastard child, or to any person who may have been appointed to have the custody of such child, any sum to be paid in pursuance of an order on that behalf."

On the 30th of July, 1872, Mr. Cardwell, during the discussion on the Military Forces Localisation Bill, pledged himself to the omission from the Mutiny Bill of the ensuing Session of the obnoxious 40th section. Mr. Forster, when addressing his constituents at Bradford, on September 27th, being questioned on this matter, said the question was this—whether he was in favour of keeping upon the statute book that provision in the Mutiny Act by which a soldier was not liable, as any other person would be, to pay towards the support of a bastard child. He was not aware it was in the Mutiny Act, and when he found it he was shocked, as he had no doubt his friend was when he found it there, and he made it his business to speak to Mr. Cardwell, with whom it mainly rested, and he (Mr. Forster) was very glad to tell them that Mr. Cardwell stated in the House of Commons, towards the close of last session, that although he could not at that moment, on such short notice, undertake to bring in a Bill to repeal that clause, he did not think it was in accordance with what ought to be, and he was prepared very seriously to consider it without delay. He (Mr. Forster) intended to give Mr. Cardwell's exact words, but the statement was made late at night, and did not seem to have been reported. He therefore wrote to him about it, and he was empowered to make the statement he had given."

On the 22nd of November, 1872, Mr. Gurdon wrote to the secretary of the Vigilance Association, as follows:—

"As regards the provision of the Mutiny Act to which you call Mr. Gladstone's attention, I am directed to remind you that the views of the government were declared last year, but want of time, and this alone, prevented any proposal being made to Parliament on this subject, which will not, however, be overlooked."

On February 24th, 1873, Mr. Cardwell, in his speech on introducing the army estimates, explicitly renewed his promise that the 40th section should be expunged. The Mutiny Act and the Marine Mutiny Act, 1873, in which similar provisions occur, are now law, and the public are in a position to judge of the manner in which ministerial pledges have been kept.

Section 40 of the Mutiny Act, 1873, has been amended by the omission of these obnoxious words, and a new section, sec-

\* Although, according to the usual construction of English law, husband and wife are held to be one person, yet for the purpose of enabling soldiers to break with impunity every previous tie, the wife is here held to be a "relation."

tion 107, the last in the Bill, has been introduced, and reads as follows:—

"Notwithstanding anything in this Act contained, a soldier shall be liable to contribute to the maintenance of his wife and of his children, and also to the maintenance of any bastard child of which he may be proved to be the father, to the same extent as if he were not a soldier, but execution shall not issue against his military necessaries or equipments, nor shall he be liable to be imprisoned or taken out of Her Majesty's service in consequence of such liability, or any order made for enforcing the same; nor shall he be liable to be punished as an idle or disorderly person, or as a rogue and vagabond, or as an incorrigible rogue, under the Act passed in the fifth year of the reign of King George the Fourth, chapter 83, intituled 'An Act for the punishment of idle and disorderly persons, and rogues and vagabonds, in that part of Great Britain called England,' for the offence of neglecting to maintain his family or any member thereof, or of leaving his family or any member thereof chargeable to any place or to the common fund of any union."

"When any order is made under the Acts relating to the relief of the poor, or under the Bastardy Acts, on a soldier for the maintenance of his wife or children, or for the maintenance of any such bastard child as aforesaid, or any of such persons, a copy of such order shall be left at the office of one of Her Majesty's principal Secretaries of State, and the said Secretary of State may withhold a portion not exceeding sixpence of the daily pay of a non-commissioned officer who is not below the rank of sergeant, and not exceeding threepence of the daily pay of any other soldier, and allot the sum so withheld in liquidation of the sum adjudged to be paid by such order."

"Where a summons is issued against a soldier under the said Acts, or any of them, for the purpose of enforcing against him any such liability as aforesaid, and such soldier is quartered out of the petty sessional division in which the summons is issued, the summons shall be served on his commanding officer, and it shall not be valid unless there be left therewith, in the hands of the commanding officer, a sum of money to be adjudged as costs incurred in obtaining the order (should an order be obtained against the soldier) sufficient to enable him to attend the hearing of the case and return to his quarters; and no summons whatever under the said Acts, or any of them, shall be valid against the soldier if served after the time at which an order has been given for the embarkation for service out of the United Kingdom of the body of troops to which the soldier belongs."

The Committee feeling how little satisfactory such an amendment of the obnoxious section really was, immediately memorialised Mr. Cardwell on the subject, but received only a mere official acknowledgment. They also wrote to every member of the cabinet, but without any avail in securing even the pretence of further amendments. A paper setting forth the true character of the section was sent to every member of the House of Commons, but the Committee failed to attract parliamentary attention to the matter.

In the House of Lords the Bill was read a first time on Thursday, April 3rd, along with the Marine Mutiny Bill. Both Bills were read a second time on Friday, April 4th, after which the House adjourned for the Easter holidays. The Committee of the Vigilance Association having failed to secure attention in the House of Commons, addressed themselves to the House of Lords, to whom they forwarded the following petition:—

To the Right Honourable THE LORDS SPIRITUAL AND TEMPORAL in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of the Vigilance Association for the Defence of Personal Rights, and for the Amendment of the Law in points wherein it is injurious to Women.



Sheweth—

That your Petitioners, having regard to the action of Parliament in omitting from the Mutiny Bill, and from the Marine Mutiny Bill, 1873, those provisions which expressly exempted each soldier and marine in Her Majesty's service from liability for the maintenance of his wife and of his children, legitimate or illegitimate, and in expressly providing that, "Notwithstanding anything in this Act contained, a soldier (or marine) shall be liable to contribute to the maintenance of his wife and of his children, and also to the maintenance of any bastard child of which he may be proved to be the father, to the same extent as if he were not a soldier" (or marine), regret, nevertheless, that the provisions which follow restrict the application of the just principle hereby affirmed, and by the introduction of various obstacles in the way of its enforcement, render it practically inoperative.

They object—

- 1st.—That every soldier and marine is still exempted by express enactment from the punishment to which a civilian who deserts his wife and family is by law liable.
- 2nd.—That though a master has the right and the power to reclaim a runaway apprentice who has absconded and enlisted, a deserted wife has no right and no legal power to reclaim the husband who has, by enlisting in Her Majesty's service, abandoned her and their children.
- 3rd.—That even when an order under the Acts relating to the relief of the poor shall have been made by the Justices against such a husband, it is left absolutely at the discretion of one of Her Majesty's principal Secretaries of State, or of the Lord High Admiral, to determine whether any, and if so, what amount of the soldier's or marine's pay shall be contributory to the maintenance of those who have both natural and legal claims upon him.
- 4th.—That the provision requiring that when a summons under the Poor Law Acts, or under the Bastardy Acts, is issued against a soldier or marine, who is, at the time at which such summons is issued, quartered out of the petty sessional division in which such summons is issued, the summons shall be served on his commanding officer, and shall not be valid unless there be left herewith in the hands of the commanding officer a sufficient sum of money to enable the soldier or marine to attend the hearing of the case, and to return to his quarters, is a cruel hindrance in the way of poor and deserted women, since a wife can only proceed against the husband who has deserted her by the intervention of the Guardians of the Poor, who are not likely to advance money on this behalf, and the mother of an illegitimate child is usually poor and friendless, and without money to deposit for such a purpose.
- 5th.—That the lawful wife and the legitimate children of a soldier will be under the new section in an even worse position than before, since under Article 177 of the Articles of War the Secretary of State may deduct 3d. per day from the soldier's pay towards the maintenance of his wife and children, whilst under the proposed section a woman will have to come upon the parish before she can obtain this measure of relief.
- 6th.—That the expressly freeing soldiers or marines about to embark for service abroad from any and all obligations imposed under the Bastardy Acts or the Acts for the relief of the poor is in direct opposition to the principle now admitted by Parliament, and is an incentive to immorality and desertion.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your Lordships will so amend the Mutiny Bill, and the Marine Mutiny Bill, that no soldier or marine may henceforth be enabled to escape or evade those obligations for the maintenance of his wife and of his children to which, if he were not a soldier or marine, he would be liable.

And your Petitioners will ever pray.

Signed by order and on behalf of the Committee,

ELIZABETH C. WOLSTENHOLME, Secretary.  
April 5, 1873.

The Committee desire to call attention to the subjoined report, taken from the *Times* of April 22nd, 1873, of the proceedings in the House of Lords on Monday, April 21st, when the Mutiny Bill and the Marine Mutiny Bill passed through Committee.

They were read a third time and passed on Tuesday, April 22nd, and received the royal assent on Thursday, April 24th.

The Committee ask the lovers of justice everywhere to assist them throughout the year by bringing this matter before the public, and, in particular, before their own Parliamentary representatives, and by urging the necessity so to amend the Mutiny Act and the Marine Mutiny Act, that no soldier or

marine may henceforth be enabled to escape or evade those obligations for the maintenance of his wife and of his children to which, if he were not a soldier or marine, he would be liable. Nothing further will be obtained without further agitation and further pressure on ministers.

But, unsatisfactory as is the manner in which Her Majesty's Government have thought it right to redeem their pledges to the nation, the Committee have, to their great regret, to call attention to another grievance—the manner in which the Mutiny Bill, and the Marine Mutiny Bill are passed into law every session.

The preamble of the Mutiny Bill opens, year by year, with the following words:—

"Whereas the raising or keeping a standing army within the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in time of peace, UNLESS IT BE WITH THE CONSENT OF PARLIAMENT, IS AGAINST LAW."

The annual passing of the Mutiny Bill has been hitherto regarded as our great constitutional bulwark against military despotism, but it now appears that the annual passing of the Mutiny Bill has long been a mere matter of form, that the Bill is to all intents and purposes, simply a departmental order, an annual edict, issued by the War Office, and accepted implicitly by Parliament. The facts which the Committee have now to relate, explain to some extent how it is that members of Parliament—including cabinet ministers—have been able sincerely to express themselves "shocked" at the iniquitous character of Section 40 of the Mutiny Act, and to profess their ignorance of provisions contained therein, which provisions they have yet affirmed and re-affirmed year by year for thirty-five years.

Other Bills, whether introduced by the Government or by private members, are ordered by the House to be printed and are circulated, a copy being sent to each member before the date fixed for the second reading, whilst any person whatsoever can purchase a copy at the Parliamentary Paper Office. These two Bills, however, are never printed for circulation as Bills, nor are they accessible to the general public—until they have become law. In the case of the Mutiny Bill the War Office prints a limited number of copies (200 it is said) for its own use, and any M.P. who desires to study the proposals of the Bill, or any changes that may be introduced, has to apply at the Vote Office for a copy. It is true that along with the usual Parliamentary Papers a statement of any proposed changes in the Bill is sent to members, but the dates the Committee have now to give will show how little importance is attached to the whole matter.

After the expression of public feeling called forth last year by the discussion of Section 40 of the Mutiny Act, it might have been supposed that this year, if ever, the Bill would have been printed and circulated in such a manner, and at such a date as to allow of the fullest criticism. Such, however, has not been the case. The Bill, as previously stated, has not been "circulated" at all. It was brought in and read a first time on the night of Friday, the 21st of March. It was put down for second reading for Monday, the 24th of March, and actually read a second time during the continuance of the sitting of that day, at an early hour (a few minutes before one o'clock) on the morning of Tuesday, the 25th of March. It was put down for Committee for the same evening, and it is a noteworthy fact, that the paper setting forth the intended changes in the Bill was not delivered to members till Wednesday, the 26th of March. The Committee on the Bill was however postponed. It was considered in Committee and reported, on the night of Thursday, the 27th, or rather, during the first hours of Friday, the 28th of March, and was "considered as amended,"

the same day, being read a third time and passed, on Monday, March 31st, or, strictly speaking, on Tuesday morning, the 1st of April. The Marine Mutiny Bill was hurried through in a similar way, a new Section, 93, being substituted for the obnoxious words in Section 54.

The reason for the haste with which these measures were passed is intelligible enough. The Acts of 1873 lapsed so far as Great Britain and Ireland are concerned, on the 25th of April, 1873; and unless the Acts of 1873 had received the Royal assent before that date, the continued existence of the army would have been illegal, and the marines in Her Majesty's Service would have been freed from the control of military law. But this very fact leaves the conduct of the Government in introducing these measures so late without the shadow of an excuse. Such measures, when important changes are intended, ought to be introduced as early as possible in the session, and made widely public in order that the proposals of the Government may be freely and fully criticised. That this has not been done is sufficient proof of the growing danger to our national liberty from two sources. First, from the officialism of PERMANENT OFFICE-HOLDERS, especially in these two great departments of the service, who appear to consider measures of great national moment as matters of departmental routine only, and to have no conception of their real bearing upon the well-being of the nation, and secondly, from the apathy of Parliament itself.

The Committee call attention to these dangers, in the hope that some means may be found of creating a public opinion which shall force upon Parliament the necessity of so reforming the existing modes of procedure, that the time which is now wasted upon trifles may be given to matters of graver moment; which shall also jealously watch any and every encroachment of the Executive, as such, upon the functions of the Legislative power; and which shall successfully resist any attack made by either power upon the principles of justice and of freedom.

Such a force is now more than ever needed. Recent enactments and still more recent proposals for legislation have painfully shown that representative institutions as they at present exist among us, furnish no security against unjust, immoral, and tyrannical legislation, whilst even under the best devised representative institutions, it will still be true that "THE PRICE OF LIBERTY IS ETERNAL VIGILANCE."

ELIZABETH C. WOLSTENHOLME,

27, Great George Street, Westminster. Secretary.

Report of proceedings in the House of Lords on Monday, April 21st, 1873 (reprinted from the *Times*):—

#### MUTINY BILL.

On the motion for going into Committee,

The Marquis of SALISBURY suggested that the noble marquis the Under Secretary for War should give some explanation in respect of a somewhat important change which had been made in this historical bill.

The Marquis of LANSDOWNE said that when making the motion for the second reading of the Bill he called attention, in a few words, to the alteration in what used to be the 40th clause of the Mutiny Act. Under that scheme the soldier used to be exempted from the liability which devolved upon every man to support his wife and his children, whether legitimate or illegitimate. By the 107th section of the Bill now before their lordships it was proposed to put an end to that exemption, and to render the soldier liable in respect of his wife and of his children; but, in order to secure that the public might not be deprived of the soldier's services, the War Department had felt obliged to limit, by one or two restrictions, the principle

established by Clause 107. First it was proposed that, in the case of non-commissioned officers of a rank not lower than that of sergeant, the amount for which the man should be liable should be 6d. a day, and that in the case of privates and of non-commissioned officers under the rank of sergeant the amount should be 3d. The other limitation was in the shape of a proviso that where the putative father of a child was resident outside the petty sessions district in which the mother resided, and in which the summons against him was to be heard, money sufficient to pay the expenses of his journey to the latter place should be lodged in the hands of the commanding officer. In some cases that would, no doubt, prevent poor women enforcing the law; but, on the other hand, if the expenses were to be paid by the public, there might be collusion between the soldier and persons residing in a place to which he desired to make a little trip. He had not thought it necessary to go very fully into the matter on the second reading, because from the appearance of the front Opposition benches on that occasion he did not think the proposed alterations excited any very great amount of interest on that side of the House.

The Marquis of SALISBURY thought it would have been desirable to print the Bill with the amendments. *The restrictions to the liability under the 107th clause were very important, and it might be that they amounted practically to a denial of a boon which Parliament by that section would purport to grant.* There had been so many instances lately of the imperfect manner in which Bills were drawn that it was desirable to have clauses, and amendments in clauses, very closely looked to.

The Duke of RICHMOND asked whether there was any reason why the Bill should not be presented. Who was to pay the expenses of the soldier's journey?

The Marquis of LANSDOWNE replied that if the claim against the soldier was made out the expenses would be recovered from the soldier in the shape of stoppages.

Lord CAIRNS asked whether he was right in supposing that if a poor woman deposited two sovereigns to pay the soldier's expenses from a distant place, and made good her claim on the hearing before the magistrates, she was only to recover the two sovereigns by instalments, procured from the man in the shape of small stoppages. If this were so he thought an amendment was required, because such a provision would, in many cases, render the section a dead letter.

The Marquis of LANSDOWNE said that where the soldier was at a distance no doubt the section would be practically a dead letter; but he did not see how that was to be prevented except at a risk of loss and inconvenience to the public. The amendment of the 40th section of the Mutiny Act was a matter that had long been canvassed. This Bill had come up from the other House, and on the second reading no objection had been made to it by any of their lordships. It was absolutely necessary that the Mutiny Bill should be passed without much further delay.

Lord CAIRNS asked when the existing Mutiny Act expired.

Viscount HALIFAX said on the 25th inst., and therefore it was essential that this Bill should receive the royal assent on the 24th.

The Bill then went through committee and was reported.

The Marine Mutiny Bill also passed through committee, and was reported.

FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE, presented at the Annual General Meeting, on November 6th, 1872. In coloured cover, price 6d.



MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR  
WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

## TWO HUNDRED GUINEAS

are offered to the Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage by Two Friends, on condition that the remainder of the sum of Two Thousand Guineas is promised during the month of May. May 1st, 1873.

The committee earnestly appeal to the friends of the cause for aid in raising the above sum. The efficiency of the work for the coming season depends on the result of their efforts to obtain funds to provide for it. The generous response which was made to their appeal for the Prize Fund of last year enabled them greatly to extend the scope and the force of their operations. The whole of the money thus obtained has been devoted to the work of spreading information and evoking public opinion in preparation for the parliamentary campaign of 1873. The result has been a largely increased expression of assent to the justice of the claim and of demand for the passing of the measure. The committee enter on the labours of another season without a balance in the treasurer's hands, but free from debt. Friends who may assist them are assured that each fresh contribution will initiate fresh work, and that all funds now collected will be directly applied to present and future operations.

Leaving behind the work that is done, and looking with hope and confidence to the future, the committee earnestly appeal for that support which is needful to enable them to continue and extend the labours which have been already rewarded with so substantial a measure of success.

Donations of any amount will be gratefully received.  
He gives twice who gives quickly.

LYDIA E. BECKER, SECRETARY.  
28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS RECEIVED DURING  
APRIL, 1873.

	£	s.	d.
Mr. and Mrs. J. P. Thomasson .....	50	0	0
Mr. H. B. Samuelson, M.P. ....	5	5	0
Miss Harriette Rigby .....	5	0	0
Mr. H. M. Steintal .....	5	0	0
Mr. A. Ireland .....	3	3	0
Mrs. Behrens .....	2	2	0
Mrs. Lucas .....	1	1	0
Mrs. Makdougall Gregory .....	1	1	0
Representatives of the late Mr. W. F. Cowell Stegney .....	1	1	0
Miss Colling .....	1	0	0
Mr. Joseph Atkinson .....	1	0	0
Mrs. George Sims .....	0	14	6
Miss Atkinson .....	0	10	0
Miss Maria Atkinson .....	0	10	0
Dr. Gamage .....	0	10	0
Mr. F. E. Marshall .....	0	10	0
Miss Frances A. Whitehead .....	0	5	0
Mr. John Lloyd .....	0	5	0

£78 17 6

S. ALFRED STEINTHAL, Treasurer.

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 107, Upper Brook-street; or to the Secretary, Miss BECKER, 28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester.  
107, Upper Brook-street, Manchester.

A Woman's Question for Home Study.

THE RATEPAYER'S RELEASE.—The greatest problem of the day completely solved in twenty chapters. Price Sixpence. James Blackwood and Co., London; and all Booksellers.

### CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

Contributions to the funds of the Central Committee of the National Society for Women's Suffrage, 9, Berners Street, London, W., from March 22nd, to April 26th, 1873.

	Donations.			Subscriptions.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Miss Edith New .....	0	5	0			
Mrs. C. Treppin .....	1	0	0			
Miss Warren .....	0	10	6			
Mrs. Twanley .....	0	10	0			
Mrs. Scull .....	0	2	6			
Mrs. Mouat .....	1	0	0			
Mr. and Mrs. Grimshawe .....	1	0	0			
Miss Holland .....	1	0	0			
Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Webster .....	2	0	0			
Miss K. Hill .....	1	0	0			
Miss Boucherett .....	2	0	0			
Mr. Edward Webster .....	1	1	0			
Mrs. Gough Nicholls .....	3	0	0			
Mr. and Mrs. W. T. Malleson .....	3	3	0			
Miss Courtenay .....	1	0	0			
Mrs. Henry Taylor .....	1	1	0			
Mrs. Wade .....	0	1	0			
Mrs. Carvell Williams .....	0	10	0			
Rev. A. G. L'Estrange .....	1	0	0			
Mr. and Mrs. M. P. Manfield .....	2	2	0			
Miss Milne .....	1	1	0			
Mr. Wm. Rathbone, M.P. ....	5	0	0			
Miss Müller .....	0	10	0			
Miss Travers .....	0	10	0			
Mr. Herbert Richards .....	2	2	0			
Mr. and Mrs. J. P. Thomasson .....	50	0	0			
Proceeds of Meeting, per Mrs. F. Malleson .....	0	15	6			
"A V," per Mrs. Lucas .....	2	0	0			
	£61	18	6	£23	6	0
	23	6	0			
	£85	4	6			

CAROLINE ASHURST BIGGS, } Honorary  
AGNES GARRETT, } Secretaries.

Published every Thursday.

THE BROAD CHURCHMAN: A High-Class Weekly Journal. "The Broad Churchman" is designed to represent the principles and opinions of the Broad Church party, Laity as well as Clergy. But, besides opening its columns to a free discussion of sacred subjects, it adopts a strongly humanitarian line on political and social questions. In addition to Colonial Federation, Proportional Representation, Improvement of Labourers' Dwellings, &c., it advocates Women's Suffrage; the claims of Married Women to a fair share of legal control over their own and their husbands' children; Mr. Hinde Palmer's Married Women's Property Bill; the complete abolition of injurious monopolies excluding successful female candidates from participation in the benefits of University degrees and emoluments; the extension of Free Trade principles by throwing open to the female sex all suitable professions and employments; and the reform of the Church of England Marriage Service.

Price per Number, 2d.; by post, 2½d. Per Quarter, in advance, and by post, 2s. 8½d.

Offices: 8, Bouverie Street, Fleet Street, London.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL. Edited by LYDIA E. BECKER. — Published monthly, price (post free) three-halfpence.

London: Trübner and Co., 57 and 59, Ludgate Hill.  
Manchester: A. Ireland and Co.

Communications for the Editor and orders for the Journal may be addressed to 28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester. Price post free for one year, One Shilling and Sixpence.

Printed by A. IRELAND & Co., Pall Mall, Manchester, for the MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE, and Published by Messrs. Trübner and Co., 57 and 59, Ludgate Hill, London.—May 1, 1873.