

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

VOL. IV.—No. 45 PUBLISHED MONTHLY.

MANCHESTER, NOVEMBER 1, 1873.

PRICE 1d.—BY POST 1½d.

Contents :

Leading Articles by the Editor.

Election Intelligence:—Bath, Taunton, Hull.

Public Meetings: Gloucester, Merthyr Tydvil, Portishead, Dunstable, Great Malvern, St. Leonard's, Tunbridge Wells, Worthing, Christ Church, Winchester,

Saltburn-by-the-Sea, Redcar, Scarborough, Southport, Hull, Bolton. Scotland: Shetland, Kirkwall, Stromness, Wick, Tain, Lerwick, Thurso, Halkirk, Stornoway.

The Property of Married Women:—Annual Meeting.

Treasurer's Reports and Announcements:—Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage; Central Committee; Bristol and West of England Branch. Classical Scholarships.

DURING the past month three Parliamentary elections have taken place, all of which have some significant bearing on the progress of the cause. The seats for Bath, Taunton, and Hull have been vacated, in each case by members who were persistent opponents of women's suffrage. Two of the vacancies were created by death, the third by the acceptance of office by the present SOLICITOR-GENERAL. At Bath the Liberal candidate, Captain HAYTER, was not decided in the expression of his views, and although he declined to pledge himself to vote for the measure, he did not say that he would vote against it. The Conservative candidate, Mr. FORSYTH, Q.C., stated that he concurred with the principle of the measure, and would be prepared to vote for it. The independent candidate, Mr. CHARLES THOMPSON, who was brought forward on advanced Liberal principles by the supporters of the Permissive Bill, was also in favour of Women's Suffrage. His chances, however, were from the first hopeless. Captain HAYTER was returned in the room of Dr. DALRYMPLE, and the change may ultimately be for the advantage of the cause, while it cannot possibly be for the worse.

The most active and conspicuous opponent of the rights of women, not only to the suffrage, but to hold property on the same conditions as men, was the member for Taunton, who, having originally obtained his seat by the decision of an election tribunal, used the influence so acquired to oppose every measure which was brought forward in the House of Commons for the amelioration of the condition of women. By speech and vote he opposed the proposal to remove their electoral disabilities, and not content with this, this self-elected spokesman for what he assumed to be the wishes of those whose opinions he was doing his best to stifle, took upon himself the functions of an amateur "Parliamentary whip." Year after year the note urging members to attend and vote against the Women's Disabilities Removal Bill has been signed "HENRY JAMES." Again, when Mr. HINDE PALMER

moved the second reading of his Bill to amend the Married Women's Property Act, Mr. JAMES voted against it. On that occasion the ATTORNEY-GENERAL said that if the House of Commons was as much aware as every lawyer is aware of the state of the law of England as regards the property of women, even after the very recent humane improvement in it, he believed it would not hesitate to say that it was more worthy of a barbarian than of a civilised State. Mr. JAMES, being a lawyer, must have been fully aware of the state of the law, yet he voted for the maintenance of a system which humaner men consider barbarous, and for the retention of that which even Mr. FITZJAMES STEPHEN calls "the stupid coarseness of the laws as to the effect of marriage on property." When Mr. GLADSTONE, in 1871, on the debate on Mr. JACOB BRIGHT'S Bill, said that in various important particulars the law did less than justice to women, and that in his opinion the man who should succeed in arranging a safe and well-adjusted alteration of the law as to political power, and who should see his purpose carried onward to its consequences in a more just arrangement of the provisions of other laws bearing upon the condition and welfare of women, would be a real benefactor to his country, Mr. JAMES in his indignation that the Prime Minister should bestow his sympathies in the direction of women did not hesitate to rise in his place in the House of Commons in order to fling at his Parliamentary leader the taunt that "popularity has no future."

That women should desire to oppose the return to the House of Commons of a member who was hostile to them on every question affecting their interests, was of course to be expected, and Mr. JAMES need not have been surprised to find that ladies were exerting themselves actively against his return. The questions which divide the Liberal and Conservative parties are, so far as the nation of women is concerned, of subordinate importance to the cardinal questions of despotic *versus* representative govern-

ment, and security of property rights, which men of both political parties have long ago decided for themselves in the direction of freedom. If there were any large class of men in this country labouring under political disabilities, and deprived of legal security for their property, assuredly these men would make it their first object to obtain such a reform of the electoral and property laws, as would secure their personal rights, and would use any political or social influence at their command in this direction. But Mr. JAMES, who never missed an opportunity of voting against women, thought it very hard that women should use their influence against him. His political creed seems to be that it is very right for Mr JAMES to oppose women, but very wrong for women to oppose Mr. JAMES. His speech at Taunton, reported in another column, contains statements and expressions which are surprising in one from whom one would at least expect the ordinary courtesy of gentlemen, to political opponents who are actuated by public spirit in the defence of principles which they believe to be just, and to whom no one could attribute personal or party motives. Mr. JAMES was very indignant with the rival candidate for calling him a political adventurer; yet he did not hesitate to apply language having exactly the same meaning to the accomplished young ladies, whom he thought fit to stigmatise as "social failures." He said that the ladies who had come into the borough to advocate the cause of women's suffrage, went day by day to houses while the men were absent, and told the wives that they had not got their fair rights and privileges, that in their position as wives they were mere slaves. The insinuation thus conveyed, that the ladies acted in an underhand manner, and that they desired to keep from the knowledge of the husbands the subject of their conversations with the wives, is as false as it is base and unmanly. If the ladies had found the husbands at home they would have rejoiced at the opportunity of informing the electors of the demerits of Mr. JAMES on every question where justice to women is concerned. By informing the wives on this subject, and endeavouring to induce them to use what influence they possessed over the minds of their husbands against the return of so unworthy a representative of the interests of women, they only did their duty to the cause which they came to represent. Women have a perfect right to form and to express freely opinions on the laws affecting them, to communicate information to one another, and to combine for the purpose of using whatever social or personal influence they possess in order to obtain a reform of these laws.

They are now beginning to do this, their influence has been already felt in elections, and will be felt more and more. The sooner politicians begin to recognise that fact and provide a legitimate mode of expression for the new influence so arising, the better for themselves and for the nation.

Mr. JAMES said that these ladies "behind the backs of husbands endeavoured to make wives discontented with their lot, and told them, *without foundation and proof*, that the law of the country prevented married women from enjoying their rights." If this statement means anything, it means that in Mr. JAMES'S opinion there is no foundation or proof for the assertion that the law of England does not secure to women all the rights they ought to have. That may be Mr. JAMES'S opinion, but it is not that of women themselves, nor that of the present House of Commons, which passed, in 1870, without a division at any of its stages, a Bill abrogating the present law; and as this Bill was altered in the House of Lords, passed the second reading of a Bill based on the same principles by a substantial majority in the early part of last session. It would have been but candid on the part of Mr. JAMES to have informed his hearers of these facts, which many of them would consider a strong foundation for the assertion, that the present laws did not give to women all the rights they ought to have.

That Mr. JAMES, in spite of his opposition to granting electoral and property rights to women, should have been returned for Taunton, is a proof of the need of representation for women. Judging from the proportion in other places, there must be at least 200 women householders, who would have been on the register had household suffrage been the rule in boroughs. Mr. JAMES'S majority was 87, it would have been, therefore, of the utmost importance to him to pay attention to any just claim on behalf of the section of society represented by these votes. In such a case he would not have ventured to say that there was no foundation for the assertion that the law did not secure to women all the rights they ought to have—he would have been bound to inquire into the matter, and to pay more respectful attention to the alleged grievance; the same would be true of the rival candidate, so that due consideration for the interests of women would in any case have been secured. On the other hand, there would be no danger that women could, even if they wished it, extort any undue advantage at the expense of the interests of men. A candidate who proposed anything

unjust for the sake of conciliating the 200 women electors would array against himself the 1,800 votes of men.

In the case of Taunton, the addition of the women householders to the register, would possibly not have affected the result of the election. Mr. JAMES might have been elected all the same, but in that case he would have gone as the representative of the women as well as the men. A correspondent from Taunton informs us that he is anxious to carry out the desires of his constituents as far as possible, therefore, he might prove a faithful representative of the interests of women if he were constitutionally responsible to them for his votes on the laws affecting them.

Women's suffrage under the conditions of Mr. JACOB BRIGHT'S Bill would be an arm powerful to obtain justice, powerless to inflict injustice. It exactly fulfils Mr. GLADSTONE'S desire for a "safe and well adjusted alteration of the law as to political power," which those who are promoting confidently hope will be carried forward to its consequence in a more just arrangement of the provisions of other laws affecting women, and the need for which is distinctly shown by the incidents of the Taunton election.

At Hull the friends of women's suffrage were in the satisfactory position of feeling that the cause would gain a seat whatever the event of the election. A deputation, of which a notice appears elsewhere, waited on both candidates. Mr. REED saw the deputation in private, and gave his assent fully to the principle of the measure, but in pursuance of the policy of his election committee, who desired that their candidate should refrain from expressing his opinion on special questions, the deputation were bound not to publish his opinion until after the declaration of the poll. Colonel PEASE had no objection to letting the people of Hull know before they elected him that he was favourable to the proposal to give the suffrage to women who were householders. The ballot took place on October 22nd, and resulted in the return of Colonel PEASE. As the late member, Mr. CLAY, voted against the Bill, the gain is equal to two votes on a division.

We trust that in every election which may occur, our friends will take care that our question is fairly presented both to the candidates and the constituencies. The women's suffrage question is not one of party politics, it appeals equally to Liberals and Conservatives. In many, perhaps the majority of cases, it will be found, as at Hull, that both sides are equally willing to admit the justice of the claim. There may be special cases, where one of the candidates happens to be either a prominent supporter or

a prominent opponent of the cause, in which the sympathies and influence of women may be exercised in such a manner to appear to favour sometimes the Liberal, and sometimes the Conservative side. But this result is accidental and undesigned, and its effects will be impartial in the long run. The prominent supporters and the prominent opponents of women's suffrage are so evenly divided between the two sides of the House that even if women had the power to influence every election in which these were concerned with reference to their own questions, the result would not materially affect the balance of parties. Whenever the cause is won, it will not be by the triumph of one party over the other, but by the triumph of the principles of justice, which they both profess, over those of wrong and injustice, which both would be ready to disavow, and by the union of the best men of both the great parties of the State.

LIBERTY, EQUALITY, FRATERNITY.

(Continued from our last issue.)

MR. STEPHEN says "If society and Government ought to recognise the inequality of age as the foundation of an inequality of rights of that importance,"—(*i.e.* that of command and obedience)—"it appears to me at least equally clear that they ought to recognise the inequality of sex for the same purpose, if it is a real inequality." We deny the proposition on which Mr. STEPHEN bases his inference, and we deny the justness of the inference drawn. The relations of command and obedience which are admitted between parents and children are not based on mere inequality of age. They depend on the fulfilment of the conditions and performance of the duties of parentage. A child owes obedience to his own parents, or to those who stand towards him in the place of parents; but he owes no obedience towards other men merely because there is an inequality of age between him and them. The ground of the relation is the dependence of the child, who from weakness is unable to support and govern himself, on the sustenance and authority of the parent for maintenance and guidance. As soon as the child has gathered strength to depend on itself the "inequality of age" is not recognised in this country as furnishing the basis of a claim to obedience, although in some countries the filial relation is or was so recognised.

The sole reason for the subjection of infants to their parents and guardians is the fact that infants are unable to maintain and govern themselves. The subjection is not for the benefit of or for the sake of the parents, but for the

sake of the maintenance and education of the children. It is temporary in its duration, and tends to train children by habit of obedience into the capacity for command. The subjection of women to men is different in its reason, in its character, and in its duration. Women are capable of maintaining themselves and of governing themselves, without other assistance from men than that which men render to each other in the ordinary relations of business and society. There are vast numbers of women who maintain themselves by their own exertions, who owe nothing to the personal protection of individual men; nay, who may have helpless or incapable men dependent on them. Mr. GLADSTONE stated in the House of Commons that "the number of self-depending women is increasing from year to year, especially in our great towns." We say with Mr. GLADSTONE that "this is a very serious fact," and we may adopt Mr. STEPHEN'S style of argument and say if it be true that there is a progressive increase in the number of self-dependent women the law ought to recognise that fact.

The subjection of women to men is different in character from that of children to their parents, inasmuch as it is maintained avowedly for the sake of securing to men the services of women as wives, toys, housekeepers, or domestic servants. Men who oppose the enfranchisement of women are not afraid or ashamed to imply that if women were free they would not consent to hold these relations to men, and therefore that is necessary to hold them in legal subjection in order to secure the permanence of domestic relations. The subjection of children to their parents is never advocated for the sake of the value of the children's labour to the parents, nor for reasons analogous to what has been called the "cold mutton and buttons argument," which is still so popular with certain classes of men, neither do parents claim that vested right to the services of their children which some men claim in virtue of their sex to the domestic services of women.

The subjection of women to men is different from that of children to their parents, in that the one is temporary and disciplinary, the other permanent and lifelong. The temporary subjection of the infant to the parent is an accidental relation of two persons having inherently equal personal rights. The permanent subjection of women is affirmed to be a relation which pre-supposes inherently *unequal* personal rights. Therefore any inference from the expediency of maintaining the subjection of infants to their own parents to the expediency of maintaining the subjection of all women to all men is faulty as to fact and reasoning.

Mr. STEPHEN has adduced military service as a subject on which inequality of treatment, founded on a radical inequality of the two sexes, is admitted. He claims education as another subject on which the same question presents itself. He says, "Are boys and girls to be educated indiscriminately, and to be instructed in the same things? Are boys to learn to sew, to keep house, and to cook; and are girls to play cricket, to row, and to be drilled like boys? I cannot argue with a person who says 'Yes.' A person who says 'No' admits an inequality of the sexes on which education must be founded, and which it must therefore perpetuate and perhaps increase."

We may here remark that Mr. STEPHEN'S professed inability to argue with a person who maintains a given proposition does not necessarily prove the proposition to be false. PLATO held the doctrine that boys and girls ought to be educated indiscriminately and taught the same things. Were the philosopher to re-appear and maintain this doctrine, Mr. STEPHEN would dismiss him with the remark, "I cannot argue with PLATO." But something more than this would be needed in order to prove that PLATO was in the wrong. There are many doctrines, in themselves erroneous, which are believed by people who are sufficiently reasonable to be capable of being convinced by an opponent who has the ability to argue and to prove that they are unsound. There is no proposition so false and absurd that its falseness and absurdity cannot be demonstrated by argument. This does not imply the assertion that everybody can be convinced by the argument, because there are some persons who are unable to follow a chain of reasoning, or to judge adequately of the value of evidence. If an astronomer were to say, "I cannot argue with a man who maintains that the earth is flat," such a declaration would go no way towards proving that the earth was round. The proposition that the earth is round was established by men who knew how to argue with those who believed that it was flat; and the principles which are to serve as the basis for just legislation must be established by the same methods as have served for the discovery and recognition of the laws of nature.

In the passage we have quoted Mr. STEPHEN appears to play fast and loose with the word "education" in a manner which is more convenient for his purpose than conducive to the elucidation of a sound principle. It is remarkable that the things which he selects as appropriate respectively to boys and girls lie altogether out of the province of "education" in the proper sense of the word. The subjects he

selects for girls are matters of purely technical or industrial instruction. Those for boys refer to physical education. There are some persons who think that boys would be no worse for being trained to use their fingers in some occupation which might beguile their leisure hours and produce some useful result. There are more who believe that the bodily training afforded to girls is miserably insufficient, and that they would be mentally and physically benefited by the introduction into their schools of athletic exercises similar in spirit and purpose, if not exactly identical in kind, with those practised by boys. But setting aside these considerations, we can afford to make Mr. STEPHEN a present of the admission that every girl should be taught to sew, to keep house, and to cook, and every boy be taught to row, to play cricket, and be drilled, without prejudice to the proposition that boys and girls ought to be educated alike, and to be instructed in the same things. We object to the use Mr. STEPHEN makes of the word "indiscriminately," for we suppose he would not allow that all boys should be educated *indiscriminately*, and instructed in the same things. Since the whole field of human knowledge is too vast to be mastered by any one mind, there must be discrimination in selecting the particular subjects of instruction for each youth with reference to individual tastes, capacities, and circumstances in life. But the main purposes of education are the same whatever be the differences in its method and appliances. These are, the acquisition of information, the cultivation of habits of observation and reasoning, and the application of the knowledge and reasoning so acquired to the general purposes of life. There is no difference between boys and girls as to the manner in which they must severally acquire the mastery over any special subject of study. As there is no royal road, so there is no female road to learning distinct from that which must be traversed by men. We do not understand whether Mr. STEPHEN means to affirm that there are some branches of a liberal education which women have no right to cultivate. But it would seem that he does mean this when he "admits an inequality between the sexes on which education must be founded, and which it must therefore perpetuate and perhaps increase."

Now we think Mr. STEPHEN should not have left matters in this undefined state. If only in compassion to those women, if such there be, who are content to accept his limitation of their mental sphere, as one beyond which no woman ought to pass, he should have condescended to explain somewhat more clearly what are the subjects

of study to which he considers women have unequal rights with men. The old-fashioned notion was that boys should be taught classics and mathematics, and girls modern languages and accomplishments. The rule has become so far modified that it is no longer deemed unfeminine for a woman to understand Latin, or effeminate for a boy to know French. The old landmarks are removed, and the oracle sets up no new ones in their place. We should like to know also whether supposing the field of education is to be partitioned between boys and girls, whether male trespassers on the feminine portion are to be warned off as inexorably as girls who may show a desire to wander in the forbidden masculine ground? We are persuaded that could such a separation be effected between the education afforded to boys and girls respectively, that the consequences would be disastrous in the extreme to the mental culture of both; that there is no foundation for the assumption that the law ought to recognise an inequality between the sexes as to the right to education, that the existing inequality with regard to educational endowments and appliances is unjust and injurious in the highest degree, not only to the girls themselves, but to the community of which they will hereafter become the mothers; and further, that no human being has a right to prescribe to another human being the limit which must not be passed in the cultivation of the mental powers either as to direction or extent. Equal opportunities should be afforded to all children, without distinction of sex, for acquiring such education as may be within reach of their means, and no differences as to general culture should exist between the men and the women who associate together in the same rank of life. Individual inequalities of the widest kind there always will and must be, but there should exist no general inequality between the intellectual culture of men and women founded on difference of sex.

SALE UNDER DISTRAINT FOR TAXES.—On October 1st. Messrs. Baker and Sons offered by auction a dozen silver forks belonging to a lady, residing in Hendon, who had refused payment of the Queen's Taxes as a protest against taxation without representation. The amount assessed on her was £5. 10s. 11d.; the forks realised £7. 10s.—*Barnet Press.*

LADY MEDICAL STUDENTS.—The *London Medical Record* says that two of the Edinburgh ladies—Miss Dakins and Miss Bovell—have recently transferred their seat of study to Paris, where they have been allowed to count their previous lectures as if taken at the Paris Faculty, and have been admitted to the usual examinations in due course. Miss Dakins has thus passed her first professional examination, and Miss Bovell her third. The Paris Faculty require five examinations prior to conferring the degree of M.D. The ladies have all passed with very good notes.

ELECTION INTELLIGENCE.

BATH.

Three candidates were in the field: Captain Hayter, Liberal; Mr. Forsyth, Q.C., Conservative; and Mr. Thompson, Independent Liberal. Three meetings in support of Mr. Thompson's candidature having been attempted in the city of Bath, at each of which a number of Mr. Hayter's supporters howled without intermission, and thus prevented a hearing, the Misses Ashworth consented to allow a meeting to be held on the lawn at their residence, Claverton Lodge. The chair was occupied by Mr. W. Allen, J.P. Miss Ashworth, in addressing the meeting, said they had met for two objects—first, to vindicate freedom of speech; secondly, to support an Independent Liberal candidate. Mr. Thompson made a speech in which he expressed his opinion in favour of women's suffrage. Mr. Forsyth also was a friend to the measure. The polling resulted in the return of Captain Hayter, who, though he declined to promise to support the Bill, did not say he would vote against it.

TAUNTON.

The seat for Taunton was vacated by Mr. Henry James on his becoming Solicitor-General. Advantage was taken of this circumstance to bring the question of women's suffrage before the constituency, and to inform the electors of Taunton of the manner in which their representative had persistently opposed the grant of electoral and property rights to women, of his contemptuous refusal to enter into any discussion of the subject with the ladies who had remonstrated with him, and his public boast that he had not answered the letters which had been addressed to him by ladies of Taunton respecting his action in opposing Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill. The issue of the Taunton election turned, however, on other questions than that of women's suffrage, and Mr. James was returned by a majority of 87. Many of those who supported him are friends of our cause, and now that they have attained their more immediate object of securing the election of the professedly Liberal candidate, we must trust to their influence with him to bring his political conduct on a great question of enfranchisement into harmony with Liberal principles, and his personal conduct towards the ladies who oppose his views on matters on which they have, at least, as good a right to be heard as he has, into accordance with the rules usually adopted by English gentlemen in controversies even with political opponents. The following speech and the letter in reply appeared in the *Times*:—

The Solicitor-General addressed a meeting of his friends at Taunton on October 9. Referring to the ladies who had come into the borough to advocate the cause of women's suffrage, he said day by day they went to houses while the men were absent, and told their wives that they had not got their fair rights and privileges, that in their position as wives they were mere slaves, and that the law ought to be altered so as to give them more freedom. He thought if that were the case the wives would have found it out for themselves. He maintained that there were no greater traitors in the world against the domestic happiness alike of men and women than those ladies who, generally being social failures, endeavoured to become political successes, and behind the backs of husbands endeavoured to make their wives discontented with their lot, and told them, without foundation and proof, that the law of the country prevented married women from enjoying their rights. He was not about to discuss the question of women's suffrage in detail. If the occasion were presented, perhaps, he should do so before he left the borough, but he told them distinctly, and let there be no misunderstanding, that if he lost his seat ten times over for Taunton, he would not, while the present

feeling of women on the subject lasted, vote for female suffrage. (Applause.) (A voice: "I shan't vote for you, then, I tell ye.") Let him not be misunderstood. He saw that among the bills circulated in the town was one asking how they could vote for a man who publicly boasted he would not reply to a letter from ladies of Taunton in favour of female suffrage. He could only say that when one half of the ladies of Taunton appealed to him to support female suffrage he should then do so, because then he knew he should be acting in accordance with the feelings and sympathies of the people of the county. Till then he would not support female suffrage, though he should lose ten elections, and he said that with the full knowledge that wherever he went its advocates would dog his steps and misrepresent his opinions; he knew they would oppose him in any constituency. But sooner than yield his opinions he would accept their opposition and take the consequences of it.

To the Editor of the *Times*.

Sir,—In the *Times* of Friday, and again to-day, you quote a statement made by Mr. Henry James during the Taunton election contest, that "the ladies who had come into the borough to advocate the cause of women's suffrage went day by day into houses while the men were absent and told their wives they had not got their fair rights and privileges,—that in their position as wives they were mere slaves." I should not have thought it necessary to take any notice of a statement of this kind, uttered, as it was, during the heat of an election contest, had not the passage I have quoted been repeated and commented upon by several of the London papers. As it is, I shall be very much obliged if you will allow me to say that in making this accusation Mr. James must have been misinformed, as neither I nor the other ladies referred to acted in the manner attributed to us by Mr. James.—I am, Sir, yours, &c.,
Claverton Lodge, Bath, Oct. 14. RHODA GARRETT.

HULL.

A meeting in support of the extension of the suffrage to women was held at the Royal Institution, on October 17th, when Miss Becker delivered an address, and it was resolved that a deputation should wait on the candidates. The deputation first waited upon Mr. Reed, to whom Miss Becker, who was introduced by Alderman Dowsing, explained that they sought to get the Parliamentary franchise assimilated to the municipal, with regard to the votes of women. Mr. Reed said he would give his best attention to the subject. The deputation saw Mr. Reed in private. Miss Becker and her friends next went to the Conservative Committee Rooms, and had an interview with Colonel Pease, who said he had no objection to the reporters being present. Miss Becker stated that theirs was not a party question. The Bill for removing the disabilities of women was supported by members on both sides of the House. In particular it had been advocated by Mr. Disraeli, and the men of mark of the Conservative party. The deputation did not wish to embarrass or press Colonel Pease, but desired that he would give the Bill his most careful attention, and, if possible, his support. Colonel Pease, addressing Miss Becker, said: I have listened with pleasure to your lucid statement, and I candidly confess that I do not see any reason why a lady of independent fortune, or a householder, should not have the same privilege of voting for members of Parliament as voting for town councillors. That is my strong feeling on the matter. At the same time I do not like to go to Parliament pledged on every subject. I shall give this question the very best attention in my power, and as far as I at present see, I am fully of the same opinion as Miss Becker on this subject. The deputation having thanked Colonel Pease for the courtesy with which he had received them, then withdrew.—*Hull Packet*.

PUBLIC MEETINGS.

GLOUCESTER.

A meeting in connection with the Bristol and West of England Women's Suffrage Society was held in the Corn Exchange, on October 15th. The room was crowded. Sir D. Wedderburn, Bart., M.P., presided, and also on the platform were Mrs. Fawcett, Miss Lillias S. Ashworth, Miss Rawlings, Mr. S. Bowly, Rev. J. P. Allen, Mr. F. Sessions, Mr. Cash, and Mr. Stafford.—The Chairman said that before commencing the business of the meeting he would ask leave to read the following letter, which had been received from Mr. W. K. Wait, one of the members for the city:—

"2, Worcester Villas, Clifton, Oct. 7th, 1873.

"Dear Madam,—I am sorry that an engagement of long standing will prevent my being able to attend the meeting in favour of Women's Suffrage on the 15th inst. I should otherwise most willingly have been present. I am, I admit, a late and reluctant convert to the movement; but its necessity has been driven home to me by a Trades' Union combination among a section of our medical men here to prevent a woman earning her bread in their profession—a combination which has unfortunately been successful. I have ever been an earnest advocate for removing all obstacles and disabilities that may stand in the way of a woman working wherever she may feel her vocation leads her. This, in the present state of things, she cannot do; and as I am bound to think that the admission of women to the franchise, will, to say the least, tend to their enfranchisement in other and more important respects, it is my intention to vote in favour of the Bill you support as long as I have the honour to hold a seat in the House of Commons. I am, dear madam, yours faithfully,
"Miss Lillias W. S. Ashworth.

W. K. WAIT."

The Chairman, continuing, expressed his pleasure at presiding at this meeting, and said it was a matter of great satisfaction to find, though he himself had not the honour of a political connection with this city, one of the members for the city thoroughly sympathised with him on this question. This movement in favour of granting the suffrage to women was not a party movement. They frequently heard this phrase used, but it was not true in this particular instance, as an examination of the division list upon Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill would satisfactorily prove. Many Conservatives were among the warmest supporters of the Bill, while to the advanced section of the Liberal party the credit was due of having carried this movement through the dangerous and difficult period when it was merely a subject of ridicule. The movement had now passed that period, and, he believed, was not far removed from success. The minority of members of Parliament who supported Mr. Bright's Bill was steadily becoming more numerous, while the number of their opponents, if not actually diminishing, remained stationary. He for one did not in the least expect that when this Bill became law any additional strength would be given to the Liberal party in general or to the advanced section to which he had the honour to belong. He thought reason, common-sense, and judgment, ought to be sufficient, without any ulterior motives, to induce all to support this movement. When political privileges were to be gained there were two ways of acquiring them. One was by appealing to the reason and sense of justice of those in power, the other was by appealing to their fears. In the case of women's suffrage it was by the former course only that they could hope to achieve success. Ladies were by no means unanimous in their demands for the suffrage, or no doubt they would be successful in getting it. Few members of Parliament, too, cared to make this question one upon which their votes would turn, and the result was considerable apathy on the question. Of this there was a somewhat convincing proof during the last session of Parliament. A measure was before the House of Commons, which, if carried, would have considerably altered the present law affecting the property of married women, but it fell to the ground solely because it was found impossible to obtain a quorum

of forty members sufficiently interested to be present and keep a house. There was one practical reform which he thought might be carried out even in the present Parliament, and he intended, during the ensuing session, to do what he could towards it by introducing a Bill upon the subject. It was to obtain permission for women to study and obtain medical degrees at those Universities in Scotland which had hitherto been celebrated for their medical teaching. The Bill which he hoped to introduce would be merely one enabling such Universities as might be able, to admit ladies to their course of teaching and to their degrees. He could not think that any active opposition would be offered to such a moderate proposal. (Applause.) There were a few conspicuous symptoms showing themselves in various parts of the world that this question was making progress. From a recently-published Madras newspaper he learnt that the daughter of an official there had been appointed assistant astronomer, the first lady who had obtained such a position in that presidency. There was one particular point upon which as a member of Parliament he felt strongly. There were, he believed, a great many ladies who while they deprecated anything like political privileges, objected to the state of the law which now prevented young women from having their fair share of the great endowments in this country for educational purposes, which excluded them from many honourable callings for which they were well fitted, and which took from married women the ownership of their property and the guardianship of their children. (Applause.) He would say to those ladies who wished to get these laws amended, that they could only do so first by getting the franchise, and then by making use of it. A very short experience of the working of Parliamentary questions would prove to anyone that an unrepresented class or individual would find their interests neglected and ignored; and when ladies became electors they would receive from candidates for Parliamentary honours and full-blown legislators that attention which they had not yet been able to get. (Applause.)—Mr. F. Sessions moved, and Mrs. Fawcett seconded, a resolution affirming the principles, which was carried unanimously.—A resolution adopting a petition was moved by Mr. S. Bowly, seconded by Miss Lillias Ashworth, supported by the Rev. J. P. Allen, and carried with only two or three dissentients.—Votes of thanks to Mrs. Fawcett, Miss Ashworth, and the chairman concluded the proceedings.—*Abridged from the Gloucester Journal*.

MERTHYR TYDVIL.

A meeting, under the auspices of the Bristol and West of England Branch of the Women's Suffrage Society, was held at the Zoar Chapel, on October 14th. Mrs. Crawshay, of Cyfartha Castle, presided, and entered the building accompanied by several distinguished friends, among whom were Mrs. Fawcett, and Miss Lillias S. Ashworth, of Bath.—Mrs. Crawshay, who was received with immense cheering, said: I share with all present their anxiety to hear the two gifted ladies who are my guests to-night; but it has been intimated to me that a few words on my own part would be acceptable to some among the audience. I propose making a remark on the assertion that "women don't want the suffrage." (Cheers.) Mr. Henry James said at Taunton, last week, that if he were sure even half the women of England desired the franchise, he would vote for it, and he seemed to fancy that he was acting in accordance with the wishes of the majority of women in England in declining to vote for it. This may to some extent be true—the black slaves did not care to be set free—there must be some little experience of freedom before it is valued. But why should the women of England, who don't want to vote, be so afraid of the suffrage being given to those women who do?

They will no more be obliged to vote than men are. There are many women who do not use this privilege—do not fulfil their duty—but it would be a strong plea to bring forward, that we must not allow any men duly qualified to vote, because some do not care to vote. (Hear, hear, and applause.) Who is he who knows what proportion of women are anxious to have a voice in making the laws by which they, no less than men, are bound? No one, for the tyranny exercised by some men is so great that they prevent their wives and grown-up daughters hearing any discussion on the subject when anxious to do so. (Hear, hear.) To my knowledge there would have been some here to-night who are kept at home as if they were either children or idiots. Is it likely this state of things will continue? No. Because at some of these meetings the absence of Mrs. or Miss So-and-so will be deplored, and the true reason for her absence given; and those men who act thus tyrannically by their wives and daughters are the very ones who would most shrink from having such conduct traced home to them. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) It is only the most noble and the most generous of husbands and fathers who at the present time allow their womenkind the exercise of intellect; but the others will have to do so, and then Mr. Henry James will find himself obliged to vote for the enfranchisement of women, if he will either gain or retain a seat in the House. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) I feel sure that one reason why narrow-minded men are so averse to greater independence of thought on the part of women is that they fear it might raise the standard of intelligence throughout the country. This is a strange fear, while there are physiologists who assure us that the mind of woman is in itself an inferior article to man's mind. Perhaps they will have to modify this idea some day. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) In the year 1801, M. Sylvain Marechal wrote a book in which he discussed the question, "Ought women to learn the alphabet?" This is ironical, but really it is the point where the men went wrong. (Hear, and cheers.) They should have resolutely answered "No." But, only think, had they done so, what a far backward position Europe would hold now, for it is clearly a decree of Providence that one class cannot rise without the rest, any more than one individual can do so. What is the meaning of all the martyrdoms of all the ages? Only that the martyr was in advance of his time; and that is a crime so resented now, no less than in ages past, that though it is no longer punished by physical tortures, mental torture is still in-vogue. (Applause.)—Resolutions in support of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill were proposed and supported by Mr. Charles James, Mrs. Fawcett, Mr. W. Jones, Miss Ashworth, and carried with acclamation.—A vote of thanks to Mrs. Crawshay, Mrs. Fawcett, and Miss Ashworth, proposed by the Rector of Merthyr, concluded the proceedings.—*Abridged from the Western Mail.*

PORTISHEAD.

On September 23rd a lecture on Women's Suffrage was delivered at the Temperance Hall by Miss Helena Downing, of London. The chair was taken by the Rev. F. B. Weeks, Independent minister, who, in introducing Miss Downing, expressed himself as having much pleasure in doing so, owing to his sympathy with, and approval of the aims of the society. Miss Downing then addressed the meeting, which was well attended. She was listened to with marked attention and frequent murmurs of approval. At the conclusion of the address Mr. Lawford, Huxtable, proposed a vote of thanks, which was received with much cheering. A petition sheet laid on the table was nearly filled with signatures, and several pamphlets circulated and gladly received.

DUNSTABLE.

On Monday, September 15th, Miss Craigen addressed a meeting in the Temperance Hall, Dunstable, Mr. Thompson Smallwood in the chair. There was a good attendance, and a petition in favour of the Bill was adopted.

GREAT MALVERN.

On September 29th, an address was delivered by Mrs. John Hullab, to an influential assembly, in the Concert Room, Malvern.

ST. LEONARD'S.

There was a large and influential attendance at the Assembly Room, on October 4th, when an address on the above subject was delivered by Miss Ramsey. The chair was occupied by the Rev. Andrew Reed, B.A., and there were also on the platform Mrs. Fawcett, Mrs. Arthur Arnold, Miss Dunk, and Messrs. J. Stewart, Fawcett, Hawkes, and Arthur Arnold. The lecture was received with several manifestations of approval. A gentleman in the body of the room made a few remarks, in which, while offering no objection to the movement, he alluded to the readiness and desire which most of the gentler sex manifested to enter the married state. Mrs. Arthur Arnold replied to the remarks by alluding to the unfortunate, and in many cases, unfair position in which many women of small incomes are placed, their position of dependence making them more anxious to enter the marriage state. The reply elicited signs of hearty approval. On the motion of Mr. John Stewart, seconded by Mr. Fawcett, a petition to the legislature was adopted in favour of the removal of the electoral disabilities of female ratepayers. A vote of thanks to the chairman having been put by Mr. E. J. Hawkes, the Rev. Andrew Reed acknowledged he would sign the petition which had been adopted, as chairman of the meeting, with great satisfaction.—*Abridged from the Hastings and St. Leonard's News.*

TUNBRIDGE WELLS.

On October 6th an address, on the political disabilities of women, was delivered by Mrs. Arthur Arnold, in the Great Hall, Tunbridge Wells; Mr. Arnold occupied the chair. The address was very eloquently delivered, calling forth frequent bursts of applause, and was most attentively listened to throughout. A resolution, adopting a petition in favour of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill, was adopted, and, after a vote of thanks to the chairman, the meeting separated. The *Tunbridge Wells Gazette and Advertiser* contained an extended report of the lecture.

WORTHING.

A lecture, in connection with the National Society for Women's Suffrage, was delivered in the Town Hall, Worthing, by Miss Beedy. There was a good attendance. The chair was occupied by T. J. Serle, Esq., who warmly urged the claim of women to the franchise. After the lecture, votes of thanks to Miss Beedy and the chairman were passed, and numerous signatures were attached to a petition to the House of Commons. The *Worthing Intelligencer* contained an extended report of the lecture, and an able article advocating the claim.

CHRIST CHURCH.

A lecture on behalf of the National Society for Women's Suffrage was delivered on October 14, in the Town Hall, Christ Church, by Miss Beedy, Mr. G. Marshall in the chair. After the lecture a motion adopting a petition was proposed and seconded, and on a show of hands at least two-thirds of the crowded meeting held up their hands in its favour, while about a score voted to the contrary. The usual votes of thanks concluded the meeting.—*Abridged from the Christ Church Times.*

WINCHESTER.

A lecture on behalf of the National Society for Women's Suffrage was delivered in the Guildhall, Winchester, on October 17th, by Miss Beedy. The chair was occupied by F. Morshead, Esq., Mayor of Winchester.

Miss Beedy has also lectured on behalf of the Central Committee of the National Society for Women's Suffrage, at SOUTHWICK, on October 10, and on the 16th, at LYMINGTON.

SALTBURN-BY-THE-SEA.

On October 1st, Miss Becker delivered an address at the Zetland Assembly Rooms, Saltburn-by-the-Sea; Mrs. Lucas also addressed the meeting. Mr. James Taylor presided. At the close a discussion took place, and votes of thanks to the lecturer and chairman concluded the proceedings.

REDCAR.

Miss Becker and Mrs. Lucas addressed a meeting on October 2nd, in the Central Hall, Redcar. There was a good attendance. Mr. J. H. Webster occupied the chair. After the address of the ladies a vote of thanks was proposed and unanimously carried, and the meeting then separated.

SCARBOROUGH.

On October 17 a public meeting was held in the Town Hall, St. Nicholas-street, Scarborough, which was addressed by Miss Becker and Mrs. Lucas. There was a large attendance. The chair was occupied by Mr. Rowntree. After Miss Becker and Mrs. Lucas had spoken, a short discussion took place. A vote of thanks to Miss Becker and Mrs. Lucas was moved by Mr. Smith, and seconded by Mr. G. B. Dobson, and carried unanimously. Miss Becker acknowledged the compliment. She alluded with an expression of gratitude to the part Sir Harcourt Johnstone had taken in the movement. She moved a vote of thanks to the chairman, which was seconded by Mrs. Lucas, and put to the meeting by Mr. Councillor Whittaker, and carried unanimously, after which the meeting separated. The Scarborough papers contained extended reports of the proceedings.

SOUTHPORT.

On October 7th, an influential and fashionable assembly filled the large room of the Town Hall, Southport, to hear an address from Miss Becker. The Rev. J. L. Rentoul occupied the chair, and in introducing the lecturer expressed his hearty assent to the justice of the claim. The lecture was received with great interest, and at the close the Rev. Mr. Hinds proposed a vote of thanks to Miss Becker, which was seconded by a gentleman in the body of the hall. In returning thanks Miss Becker moved a vote of thanks to the chairman, which concluded the proceedings.

HULL.

On October 17th, Miss Becker delivered an address on the subject of women's suffrage, in the Theatre of the Royal Institution, Albion Street, Hull. Alderman Dowsing occupied the chair, and he called upon the Rev. Mr. Glover, who explained the objects of the society, of which he is one of the agents, had in view. He next called upon Miss Becker to deliver her address on "The Political Disabilities of Women; their Social and Legal Consequences." After the address discussion was courted, and in answer to Dr. Munroe, the lecturer said that the admission of women to the Parliamentary franchise would increase the constituency of Manchester by from nine to ten thousand voters, and every constituency by about one-seventh. Mr. Fountain moved, and Mr. Thorp seconded, that the Chairman, the Rev. Mr. Dixon, Mr. Elam, Mr. Raven, and Mr. King, be a deputation to wait upon the candidates with a view

of eliciting their opinions on the question of granting the franchise to women. A short discussion took place, after which the resolution was put and carried.—Mr. G. K. King moved a vote of thanks to Miss Becker for the very excellent and instructive lecture she had given.—The Rev. Mr. Dixon seconded the motion, which was supported by Mr. Ackrill, and the proceedings closed with the customary vote of thanks to the chairman.—*Abridged from the Hull News.*

BOLTON.

A large and fashionable party assembled on the invitation of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Crook, Mr. Thomasson, and Mr. and Mrs. J. P. Thomasson, at Oakfield, Bolton, the residence of Mr. Joseph Crook, formerly member for the borough. After the reception of the guests the party adjourned to the library, and Mr. Thomasson introduced Miss Becker, who delivered an address on the political disabilities of women. An interesting discussion took place, at the close of which the usual votes of thanks were accorded. An elegant and hospitable entertainment, and agreeable social intercourse, concluded the evening.

SCOTLAND.

SHETLAND.

SCALLOWAY.—On September 13th, a public meeting was held in the Congregational Chapel, Scalloway, Shetland, for the purpose of hearing an address by Miss Taylour, from Edinburgh, on women's suffrage. Miss Taylour was accompanied by Miss Agnes M'Laren, Edinburgh. There was a large attendance. Lewis F. U. Garriock, Esq., occupied the chair. After some appropriate remarks by the chairman, Miss Taylour addressed the meeting, and treated the reasons both for and against women's suffrage in a very able and clear manner. The views expressed in favour of women's suffrage were received with general applause. Mr. Moncrief moved a resolution adopting a petition, which was seconded by Mr. Gifford Laursen. Miss M'Laren then proposed a vote of thanks to the chairman, thanked the Independent congregation for the use of the chapel, and concluded by giving a sketch of the progress of the women's suffrage movement.—*Shetland Times.*

KIRKWALL.

On September 17th, a public meeting was held in the Volunteer Hall. Miss Taylour delivered an address, and resolutions in support of the principle were moved and seconded by the Rev. Mr. Spark, Mr. Morgan, the Rev. Mr. Stuart, Mr. Lamont, and Miss M'Laren, of Edinburgh. The following resolution appointing a committee was carried.—*The Orkney Herald* and the *Orkadian* contained extended reports of the meeting, and articles supporting the claim.

STROMNESS.

A public meeting was held in the Town Hall, Stromness, on September 19th, Bailie Spence in the chair. The usual resolutions were supported by Miss Taylour, Miss M'Laren, Mr. Nisbet, and Mr. Rae, after which the meeting separated.

WICK.

On September 24th, a crowded public meeting was held in Brims Hall, Wick. Provost Corner occupied the chair, and introduced Miss Taylour. The lecture was frequently applauded. Resolutions in support of the Bill were moved and seconded by Mr. Peter Reid, Mr. J. M. Sutherland, the Rev. Mr. Renny, and Mr. Brims.—Miss M'Laren, in moving a vote of thanks to the chairman, referred to the gratifying progress of the movement in and out of Parliament, stating that a large majority of the Scotch members had voted for Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill, and that seven had been converted, chiefly from

seeing how satisfactorily the women's suffrage had acted during the late school board elections. In Pollockshaws one-fourth of those who voted were women, and over Scotland no fewer than eighteen had been chosen members of school boards, including one in Ross-shire (Mrs. Matheson of Ardross). Generally the movement was making great progress, and certain success appeared near. (Cheers.) The chairman proposed a vote of thanks to Miss Taylour and Miss M'Laren, which was warmly accorded, and the proceedings closed.—*Abridged from the Northern Ensign.*

TAIN.

On September 26th, Miss Taylour delivered a lecture in the Academy Hall. The Rev. Mr. Grant occupied the chair, and there was a large audience. The lecture was very favourably received, and at the close resolutions were put and agreed to to petition Parliament in favour of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill to Remove the Electoral Disabilities of Women. Bailie Matheson and Mr. Murray, of the Inland Revenue, were among the speakers, besides the chairman. A vote of thanks was awarded to the chairman, on the motion of Miss M'Laren, Edinburgh, who accompanied Miss Taylour.—*Invergordon Times.*

LERWICK.

On August 6th, Miss Craigen addressed a meeting in the Congregational Chapel, Lerwick, Shetland, at which a petition was adopted in favour of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill.

THURSO.

On August 19, Miss Jessie Craigen gave a lecture in the Town Hall here, the subject having been women's rights. The audience was pretty fair, though not nearly so large as it ought to have been, considering the high reputation which the lecturer has won for herself, a reputation which, we think, none who heard her on Thursday evening will gainsay. J. W. Galloway, Esq., occupied the chair, and introduced the lecturer to the meeting. The lecture, which occupied fully two hours in delivery, was in every way a masterly production. At the conclusion of the lecture the chairman proposed a hearty vote of thanks to Miss Craigen for her very able and interesting lecture, and a motion was carried by the meeting in favour of Mr. Jacob Bright's Women Suffrage Bill.—*Abridged from the Northern Ensign.*

HALKIRK.

On August 25th Miss Craigen lectured in the Parish School-room, Halkirk, near Thurso, to a very full meeting.

STORNOWAY.

On September 2nd a lecture was given by Miss Craigen to a crowded meeting in the Masonic Hall, Stornoway. The United Presbyterian minister was in the chair. Nearly all the gentry of the place were assembled, and many were at the doors who could not get in. The petition was voted unanimously.

THE PROPERTY OF MARRIED WOMEN.

The annual meeting of the members and friends of the committee for amending the law with respect to the property of married women was held in the Mayor's Parlour, at the Manchester Town Hall, on October 20. The Rev. S. A. Steintal presided.

The CHAIRMAN said it might be asked why they had still to be at work as they were in behalf of the amendment of the law relating to the property of married women, after a Bill had passed Parliament in 1870? He reminded them that although Mr. Russell Gurney's Bill, which was satisfactory to the society, passed through the House of Commons with a great majority in its favour, it had undergone modifications in the House of Lords which were very unsatisfactory. The measure,

as it had passed, did not protect the money a woman earned before marriage, except such as might be deposited in a savings bank. The sum thus protected must be very small, because, as everyone knew, only a limited sum could be entrusted to such a bank. The Act did not protect the money which a woman might acquire, except she acquired it by intestacy, and unless it exceeded £300. Further, the Act did not refer at all to the cases of women married before the passing of the Act. There was therefore still as much necessity for proceeding with the agitation as there had ever been. It had indeed been a matter of grave consideration on the part of the friends of the measure in the House of Commons whether they should accept the measure as it had been altered by the House of Lords, but as it secured the earnings of women after marriage, and in some other particulars was an amendment upon the old law, it was thought advisable at the time to accept it.

Miss E. C. WOLSTENHOLME, secretary of the society, then read the following report:—

"Pursuant to the resolution adopted at the annual meeting held last year in Plymouth, your committee have to report that a memorial was forwarded to Mr. Gladstone, praying that Her Majesty's Government would undertake to deal with the question of the property of married women during the session of 1873. This memorial was presented through the Attorney-General, but your committee received no reply. Your committee, therefore, appointed a deputation to wait on Mr. Hinde Palmer, who had given notice the preceding session that he would move for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Married Women's Property Act of 1870 on the subject. A draft Bill, based on the principle of that which had received the sanction of the House of Commons in 1870, was prepared by your committee and accepted, with some slight modifications as to detail, by Mr. Hinde Palmer. It was read a first time in the House of Commons on February 7, and the second reading was fixed for February 19. Meantime Mr. Staveley Hill re-introduced the Bill which stood in his name last year, and it was read a second time on February 12. Mr. Hill's Bill became the Married Women's Property Act Amendment Bill, No. 2. Your committee in their report of last year set forth their objections to this retrograde measure, objections which have lost none of their force. Happily this Bill, which stood in the way of a more just and comprehensive measure, did not become law. The second reading of the Married Women's Property Act Amendment Bill, No. 1, was moved on February 19, by Mr. J. Hinde Palmer, and supported by Mr. Osborne Morgan, Mr. J. G. Shaw-Lefevre, Mr. W. Fowler, Mr. S. S. Dickinson, Lord Claude Hamilton, and the Attorney-General. It was opposed by Mr. G. B. Gregory, Mr. Lopez, Mr. Bourke, Mr. Wheelhouse, Mr. Muntz, and Mr. Raikes, but was carried on a division by 124 votes against 103; majority, 21. The further progress of the measure was arrested by various hindrances until a late period of the session, when Mr. Hinde Palmer succeeded in getting the Bill into committee. But the forms of the House, and the new rule with regard to opposed business, were taken advantage of by the opponents of the measure with such success, that they prevented the passing of the Bill through committee until so late a period of the session that further progress was impossible.

"The following summary shows the Parliamentary history of the measure during the session:—

"Read a Second Time: February 19—Ayes, 124; noes, 103.

"Counted Out: February 21*, March 20 and 25, April 4, May 2, and June 24.

* On this day Mr. Lopez gave notice that, on going into committee, he would move the rejection of the Bill.

"Progress Reported: March 28, April 25, and May 5.

"Postponed because of the Half-past Twelve o'clock Rule: March 4†, March 11 and 21; April 7, 21, and 22; May 9, 23, and 26; June 5 and 13; and July 15, 22, 24, and 28.

"Other Postponements: March 13 (ministerial crisis); Wednesdays, May 14 and 21, June 25, July 23, and August 1.

"Your committee desire to call attention to the significant fact that the Bill has been six times postponed by a 'count-out.' This indifference to the fate of a measure affecting the property and personal rights of that half of the people which is unrepresented in Parliament illustrates the difficulty of obtaining the attention of members to the interests of a class which has no voice in their election.

"Your committee here desire to record their most cordial thanks to Mr. Hinde Palmer for his constancy in the face of such repeated discouragements, and for his unwearied perseverance in the conduct of the measure. Early and late he has been at his post, and only one who knows the long and patient watching involved in the charge of such a Bill can appreciate the amount of personal sacrifice which has been cheerfully undergone by our zealous and indefatigable Parliamentary leader.

"Your committee are happy to announce that so far from being discouraged by his experience of last season, Mr. Hinde Palmer has given notice that he will next session re-introduce the Married Women's Property Act Amendment Bill. They congratulate their friends on the return to this country of the Right Hon. the Recorder of London, whose presence and influence in the House of Commons during the forthcoming session will doubtless contribute largely to the success of a cause with which his name is identified.

"The exertions of their able and influential Parliamentary friends should be supplemented by earnest endeavours on the part of those interested in the measure to strengthen the hands of its supporters in the House of Commons by demonstrations of opinion in its favour, and by direct demand for it in the shape of petitions.

"The committee ask their friends for a more liberal and extended measure of pecuniary support than has hitherto been accorded to them. They estimate that a sum of £500 will be required for the work of the ensuing session.

"In proportion to the amount of property at stake, the sum is almost ludicrously small. The exertions of your committee in former years were rewarded by the passing of a measure which secured to women the legal ownership of earnings estimated at twenty millions sterling per annum. The property of the women who marry each year, and which is now transferred by that marriage to the ownership of men, is probably not less in amount, while the loss and risk to creditors by the operation of the law which deprives their debtors of all their property, and frees the property so transferred from liability for the debts of the former owner, is sufficient to be a matter of serious importance.

"Enough has been said to show that there have been few, if any, Bills before Parliament dealing with pecuniary interests of so vast an aggregate amount as the Married Women's Property Act Amendment Bill; and your committee may reasonably hope that the persons interested in securing themselves in the permanent legal ownership of the property which they now hold will aid them in their endeavours to obtain the passing of a just and comprehensive measure, which shall, once for all, decide the question, so far as the legislation of this country is concerned."

Miss BECKER, treasurer to the society, read the balance sheet, which showed that the subscriptions and donations during the past year amounted to £279, which, added to other items of

† On this day, a few minutes before the Bill should have come on, the House agreed that no "opposed" business should be discussed after half-past twelve o'clock. Hence these repeated postponements.

income and a balance of £29 from last year, made a total income of £310. The expenditure amounted to £313, of which the principal items were; canvassing, £67; salaries, £100; postage £41; deputations, £15. 10s.; printing, £54; wages, £27.

Miss TOD (Belfast) moved the adoption of the report. She said she sometimes wondered whether those members of Parliament who had opposed the Bill for the amendment of the Married Women's Property Act, and the still larger number whose indifference had endangered its passing, had any idea of the amount of sickening pain which their conduct had inflicted upon very many people. Few questions directly or indirectly affected more the inner, as well as the outer life of the people, as the acts connected with the property of married women. They were continually told that the moral teaching of the young of the country must, to a great extent, be in the hands of the mothers. But women were largely disabled from doing their duty in this respect by the manner in which they themselves were treated. How could persons teach the young to do justly who were themselves unjustly dealt with? How could they teach courage when they themselves were driven to small domestic manoeuvring to get things done which they felt ought to be done, and which they ought to be able to do themselves? How could those teach prudence, caution, and foresight, who were legally incapacitated from exercising such qualities in the management of property which was their own? It was not simply to protect the wives of bad men that amendment of the present state of the law was asked. They wanted freedom for all women. It was true that good men did not act upon the state of the law as they might do, and simply ignored it. Yet the difficulties which existed might be illustrated by one or two instances which she would quote. In one case a lady had inherited from her father a considerable sum of money, which came not into her hands but those of her husband. He had the same interests and sympathies which she had, but he happened not to have the same liberality of heart. She would be inclined to give three times as much as he would, and perhaps her (the speaker's) interest in the case was sharpened by the fact that one of the objects in which the lady was interested was the Married Women's Property Association. (Laughter and "Hear, hear.") In another case a lady having considerable property had it settled upon her at her marriage with strict remainder to her children. All her children died with the exception of her son, who was provided for by a private fortune which he inherited. In the circumstances the lady had adopted the orphan daughter of a friend, to whom she was giving a good education, but to whom she could not leave a penny as provision. Her husband, who was perfectly willing to help her, was as powerless as herself. (Hear, hear.)—Mr. B. J. ELMY seconded the adoption of the report, which was agreed to.

Miss BECKER moved a vote of thanks to Mr. J. Hinde Palmer, Mr. Osborne Morgan, Mr. Shaw-Lefevre, Mr. W. Fowler, Mr. S. S. Dickinson, Lord Claude Hamilton, and the Attorney-General, for introducing and supporting by their speeches in the House of Commons the Married Women's Property Amendment Act, and also the 124 members of Parliament who voted for the second reading of the Bill. The resolution also requested Mr. Hinde Palmer and his coadjutors to take steps for the re-introduction of the measure at an early period of the forthcoming session.

Dr. PANKHURST seconded the motion, which was adopted.

Mrs. MOORE moved the re-appointment of the committee, which was seconded by Mr. GLOVER and adopted.

Dr. Pankhurst having taken the chair, on the motion of Mrs. J. P. THOMASSON, seconded by Mr. FRANK WORTHINGTON, a vote of thanks was passed to the Mayor for the use of his parlour, and to Mr. Steintal for presiding, and the proceedings then terminated.—*Manchester Examiner and Times.*

MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR
WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS RECEIVED DURING
OCTOBER, 1873.

	£	s.	d.
Mr. Benjamin Whitworth.....	100	0	0
Mr. and Mrs. Pochin.....	50	0	0
Mrs. Jacob Bright.....	20	0	0
Mrs. Williams.....	5	0	0
Miss Bostock.....	5	0	0
Mr. J. D. Lewis.....	2	0	0
Mrs. Gwynne.....	1	1	0
Mr. John Scott.....	1	1	0
Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Bart., M.P.....	1	1	0
Mr. John Every.....	1	1	0
Mr. Christopher Cooke.....	1	1	0
Mr. J. Peiser.....	1	1	0
"A Friend to Justice".....	1	1	0
Mrs. Stephenson Hunter.....	1	1	0
Mr. J. D. Milne.....	1	0	0
Mrs. Travers Wood.....	1	0	0
Dr. Henry Muirhead.....	1	0	0
Miss Sharman Crawford.....	1	0	0
Miss Knott.....	1	0	0
Mrs. Thos. Lindsay.....	1	0	0
Mrs. Robinson.....	1	0	0
Mrs. Muir.....	1	0	0
Miss Dora Thomson.....	1	0	0
Mrs. M'Culloch.....	1	0	0
Mrs. M'Kinnel.....	1	0	0
Miss Thomas.....	1	0	0
Mr. W. M. Rossetti.....	0	10	6
Mrs. Gay.....	0	10	6
Mr. John Leake, junr.....	0	10	6
Miss Corney.....	0	10	0
Dr. Gammage.....	0	10	0
Mrs. Addison.....	0	10	0
Mrs. Coppock.....	0	10	0
Mr. and Mrs. R. Sutcliffe.....	0	10	0
Mr. J. Freeston.....	0	10	0
Mrs. R. R. Moore.....	0	10	0
Miss Marshall.....	0	10	0
Hon. Mrs. Thos. Liddell.....	0	5	0
Miss Brown.....	0	5	0
Mrs. Martha Kilmister.....	0	5	0
Miss H. Lupton.....	0	5	0
Mrs. Massey.....	0	5	0
Mr. Webster.....	0	4	8
Mrs. Bleackley.....	0	3	0
Mrs. Scott.....	0	2	6
Miss Hargreaves.....	0	2	6
Mrs. M'Kerrow.....	0	2	0
Miss Wade.....	0	1	0
Collected by Miss Walton.....	1	0	0
„ Mrs. Dobson.....	0	7	0
	£211	7	2

S. ALFRED STEINTHAL, Treasurer.

107, Upper Brook-street, Manchester.

Friends who have not yet sent in their subscriptions for the financial year just closing, are earnestly requested to forward them at once to the 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.

CLASSICAL SCHOLARSHIPS.

WORCESTER COLLEGE, OXFORD.—The exhibition offered by the Provost and Fellows of Worcester College to those senior candidates successively at the recent Oxford Local Examinations who shall have obtained the highest place in the first division of the general list, provided they have been placed in the first division of one at least of the four first sections of the examination, has been accepted by Mr. Walter James Salter (fifth in order of merit), who was educated at the College School, Taunton, under the Rev. Mr. Tuckwell. This exhibition was offered to Miss Rogers, who was first on the list, but that lady declined it. Miss Rogers is daughter of Professor Rogers.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

Contributions to the funds of the Central Committee of the National Society for Women's Suffrage, 9, Berners Street, London, W., from September 23rd to October 20th, 1873.

	£	s.	d.	
"A Friend," per Miss Dowling.....	Donation	200	0	0
Mr. and Mrs. Pochin.....	„	50	0	0
Miss Lowdell.....	„	0	5	0
Miss Thomas.....	Subscription	1	1	0
Miss Bostock.....	„	1	1	0
Rev. Stopford Brooke.....	„	1	1	0
Miss Simcox.....	„	1	0	0
Mr. A. D. Tyssen.....	„	0	10	6
Mr. R. W. Dixon.....	„	0	10	0
Mr. Levy.....	„	0	5	0

£255 13 6

MARY DOWLING, Secretary.

BRISTOL AND WEST OF ENGLAND BRANCH OF
THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S
SUFFRAGE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS RECEIVED SINCE
SEPTEMBER 1st, 1873.

	£	s.	d.
"Anonymous" (conditional).....	200	0	0
Miss Ashworth.....	100	0	0
"A Friend".....	50	0	0
Mr. W. Mills Baker.....	6	1	0
Mr. and Mrs. Grenfell.....	2	2	0
Miss Hall.....	2	0	0
Viscountess Amberley.....	1	1	0
Miss M. Price.....	1	1	0
Rev. U. R. Thomas.....	1	1	0
Mrs. S. W. Browne.....	1	0	0
Mrs. Carslake.....	1	0	0
Miss Leonard.....	1	0	0
Mrs. Price.....	1	0	0
Mr. Mark Whitwell.....	0	10	6
Mrs. de L'Hoste.....	0	10	0
Mrs. P. E. Evans.....	0	10	0
Mr. and Mrs. Hamilton.....	0	10	0
Mdme. Neynieu.....	0	10	0
Mr. E. M. Oakley, B.A.....	0	10	0
Miss Price.....	0	10	0
Smaller sums.....	0	19	6

£371 16 0

Miss ANNIE WESTLAND, Secretary.
Miss ESTLIN, Treasurer.

Office: 53, Park Street, Bristol.

The Bristol and West of England Branch of the National Society for Women's Suffrage is doing much good work in the West of England. Already lectures, this autumn, have been given at Lynton, Ilfracombe, Teignmouth, Dawlish, Clevedon, and Portishead. There have also been successful meetings held at Merthyr and Gloucester, Mrs. Fawcett, and Miss L. S. Ashworth attending as a deputation from the society. Arrangements are being made also for meetings at Stroud, Cirencester, Cricklade, Malmesbury, Chippenham, Monmouth, Plymouth, Devonport, Exeter, Barnstaple, and Tiverton. We are glad to find that the society has already met with substantial support, and we trust that increased subscriptions, especially from those more immediately connected with the district, will enable it to prosecute with vigour the work so successfully begun.

The post of assistant astronomer at the Madras Government Observatory has been conferred upon Miss Pogson, the eldest daughter of the Government astronomer.