

# WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

VOL. IV.—No. 44. PUBLISHED MONTHLY.

MANCHESTER, OCTOBER 1, 1873.

PRICE 1d.—By Post 1½d.

## Contents :

Leading Articles by the Editor.  
Election Intelligence:—Dover, Bath.  
Summer Lectures:—Matlock Bridge, Buxton, Chester, Carnarvon, Bangor, Rhyl, Llandudno, Margate, Ramsgate, Lynton, Ilfracombe, Teignmouth, Dawlish, Clevedon. Scotland:—Renfrew, Ardrossan, Pollokshaws, Lerwick.

Women's Suffrage in Victoria.  
Women and Parliamentary Candidates.  
Ladies, Women, and Politics.  
Gallantry *versus* Respect.  
Mill Memorial.  
A Cry for Justice.  
The Will of the late John Stuart Mill.

List of Petitions, Married Women's Property Act Amendment Bill.  
Women's Suffrage and United States Citizenship.  
Treasurer's Reports and Announcements:—Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage; Central Committee; Married Women's Property Committee.

A STEP forward in the cause of Women's Suffrage has been made at the Antipodes. The Legislature of Victoria have had under their consideration an Election Act Amendment Bill, introduced by the Government of the colony, the leading principles of which were the re-distribution of seats, the number being raised from seventy-eight to ninety, and the country being divided into single electorates; the abolition of non-residential qualification; the extension of the suffrage to ratepayers whose rates have not been paid; and the abolition of payment for electoral rights as preparatory to a proper system for the registration of voters. The Bill, thus constituted, passed its second reading on the 24th of June. On the 8th of July an amendment was proposed by Mr. RICHARDSON, in Committee of the Bill, to strike out the word "male" from clause 6. The effect of this amendment is to give the suffrage to women as well as to men who are ratepayers. After a lively discussion the amendment was carried by 35 votes to 33, a majority of two. The total number of members of the Legislative Council of Victoria appears to be 78. Of these only ten were absent from the division on Mr. RICHARDSON'S amendment. The result may therefore be regarded as a decisive expression of the mind of the Legislative Council, whether or no the clause enfranchising women be maintained during the subsequent stages of the measure, and be destined to receive the assent of the Sovereign along with the other provisions of the Bill.

From the debate in the Victoria Legislature, given elsewhere, for which we are indebted to the *Melbourne Argus*, it will be seen that the general tone of the reasoning for and the objections against the proposal bore a strong resemblance to that with which we are familiar in the discussions in our own Parliament. The same unanswerable case, on the ground of abstract justice and regard for the interests of women in legislation, was presented by the advocates of representative government. The same depreciation of the moral and mental capacity

of women, sometimes as in this country veiled under the mask of flattery, sometimes in its less offensive undisguised simplicity, constituted the basis of the argument of those who maintained the blessings of despotism as applied to women. But the result was different. The younger nation has been the first to recognise the claims of women to a share in government by the people, analogous to that which they have borne from time immemorial, in forms of government by privileged classes. It is natural that a vigorous offshoot of the parent stock, planted in new soil amid new surroundings, should proceed more rapidly to new developments in fresh directions than could be looked for in the mighty trunk from which it sprung. Yet the graft is like unto the tree from which it came, and can develop nothing of which the germ did not lie in the organism of which it was a part. Were the vitality of the old stem impaired, we might be doubtful as to its capability of developing this latest growth of progressive and constitutional principles. But we have no reason to fear this. The bud is swelling which shall ere long blossom and bring forth the fruits for which we look. The movement for the enfranchisement of women is a vital and growing one, and the assent which the principle has won in the outposts of the British nation is a sure presage of that which shall be conquered in its heart. England was first among the nations to emancipate the negro, it will not be the last to enfranchise women.

## LIBERTY, EQUALITY, FRATERNITY.

THE above words, which have hitherto been the motto of those who sought to establish the principles they affirm, have lately been adopted by an eminent man as the title of a book, the professed object of which is to oppose the development of the ideas they represent. The particular application of the principles implied by the words, which Mr. FITZJAMES STEPHEN has set himself to controvert, is embodied in the writings of Mr. JOHN STUART MILL; and three

books, the Essay on Liberty, the Subjection of Women, and the work on Utilitarianism, are selected as exemplifications of each of the three ideas from which Mr. STEPHEN feels himself impelled to express his "dissent in the strongest way."

We are not here concerned with the first and last of these subjects, although it appears to us that Mr. STEPHEN has not represented his opponent quite fairly, and has drawn inferences from the position he attributes to Mr. MILL which are not deducible from Mr. MILL'S own language. We have never understood "Liberty" to mean—"the removal of all restraint on human conduct;" nor do we believe that Mr. MILL, or any disciple of what Mr. STEPHEN calls "The Religion of Humanity," interprets it in that sense. We think, also, that the method adopted by Mr. STEPHEN of drawing out a set of propositions in his own words, which he says are deducible from the work under consideration, and then setting himself to refute, not the original statements of his opponent, but his own version of them, which to other eyes often appears strangely distorted, transcends the limits of fair controversy.

In reading Mr. STEPHEN'S book one would think that he regarded liberty as a curse, and that he looked to restraint and coercion as the most effectual means of promoting the good of mankind. How such a faith is reconcilable with the profession of "Liberal" politics we leave to the next constituency which Mr. STEPHEN may canvass on such grounds to discover and determine. But there was a time when the trumpet gave forth a different sound. In 1862 the English law courts were called upon to decide a momentous issue in the cause of religious liberty. Dr. WILLIAMS, in the exercise of the freedom secured to the ministers of the Established Church, published an essay containing opinions then unpopular, and supposed by many to be contrary to law. He was prosecuted; and the penalty would have been deprivation of his living and his status as a beneficed clergyman. He was fortunate in an advocate who knew how to pierce the clouds of popular prejudice which had obscured the true issue, and to bring out the grand and fundamental principles on which the question hinged. Mr. FITZJAMES STEPHEN'S defence of Dr. WILLIAMS was subsequently published in a volume, and it doubtless formed an epoch in the mental history of all thoughtful persons into whose hands it fell, and who were previously unaware of the legal and historical facts on which the argument is based. Even at this distance of time, and when the immediate

interest of the controversy has passed away, we turn to the book with renewed admiration for the noble thoughts and noble language in which it abounds. Freedom is its watchword. "Do not assume the functions of a legislator, and that for the sake of restraining, and "not enlarging, liberty." And he speaks of the cause he is defending as "a cause which might dignify the greatest "genius that ever wore these robes, which might enlist the "warmest sympathies of the human heart, for it is the "cause of learning, of freedom, and of reason." We do not believe that the advocate will command these sympathies in an equal degree, when the cause he is defending is that of restraint, coercion, and force.

The portion of Mr. STEPHEN'S later work with which we are most directly concerned is that in which he maintains the expediency of the legal subordination of one sex to the other. We advert to this, not because there is any novelty in the views advanced by Mr. STEPHEN, but because the grounds on which he bases his opinion are simply the old common-places; and it is instructive to find that so accomplished an advocate can neither discover any fresh arguments nor dress up the old ones in a logical manner. He says,—“The first point is to consider “whether it (*i.e.*, the law) ought to treat them (*i.e.*, men “and women) as equals, although, as I have shown, they “are not equals.” Now, it appears to us that a fallacy underlies these words. The assumption implied in the question is that the law ought to treat as equals those only who are equals in moral, physical, and intellectual vigour. If this be so the law ought not to treat all men as equals, since there are among men all gradations of physical and intellectual vigour. But if the personal rights of all men are equal in all things that concern their individuality as men, notwithstanding all differences of personal strength and power, logic seems to demand that the personal rights of women and men shall be equal in all that concerns their individuality as human beings, notwithstanding any difference which may exist between them in physical strength. Another false assumption is that the recognition of equality before the law implies that the law is supposed to secure equality of condition among men, or as between men and women. But the equality for which we contend is aimed at no such conclusion. It is the equality which may be fairly demanded by those who are started on the race of life. It is the duty of the umpire in a race to see that all the competitors start on a footing of equality. It is no part of his duty to provide that they shall reach the goal in equal line.

Mr. STEPHEN has mentioned the inequality of age as one which is and which ought to be recognised by the law in bestowing unequal rights on persons of unequal age, and he places the inequality of sex on the same footing. But the inequality of rights between young and adult persons does not extend to all personal rights; there are certain rights secured to the youngest infant—to the unconscious babe—which the law protects as jealously as the rights of the strongest man. The law allows and secures property rights to the unborn child. The law protects with the highest sanction known to it the life of the new-born babe, equally with that of the full grown man. It is clear, therefore, that there are certain personal rights with which society and the law invest men at an age when they are utterly unable to assert or even comprehend them. If it were thought expedient to invest women with equal property rights with men, and with the electoral franchise, the law would be as competent to secure these rights to women—notwithstanding any inferiority in physical power—as it is to secure the property rights of infants, who are infinitely weaker than women, but who are in this respect treated by the law as the equals of the strongest men.

The legal disabilities, founded on inequality of age, differ so essentially from those founded on inequality of sex, that no argument can be drawn from expediency in one case as to expediency in the other. The same essentially inherent personal rights are recognised in men of all ages—but during the period when their faculties are immature they are disabled from the exercise of functions which require a certain degree of maturity of powers for their due performance. An infant cannot divest himself of property, or bind himself by contract; these disabilities are imposed for his own protection. An infant cannot exercise the franchise; this disability is imposed for the benefit of the State, which rightly requires, as a qualification for the suffrage, a presumed age of discretion for its exercise. No inference can be drawn from the fact that “perhaps a third or more of the average duration of human “life—and that the portion of it in which the strongest, “the most durable, and beyond all comparison the most “important impressions are made on human beings, the “period when character is formed—must be passed by “every one in a state of submission, dependence, and “obedience to orders”; to the conclusion that half of the human race should remain throughout their whole lives in a condition of subjection. The influence exercised by this state of tutelage and obedience on the mind of an

individual who knows that it is but the preparation for a period of his life when he shall become independent, and even be called upon to assume towards others the attitude of commander or guardian, will be widely different from that exercised on the mind of one who is brought up in the faith that it is a natural and permanent condition. There may be differences of opinion as to the duties and responsibilities which ought to be imposed by the State on men and women, just as there may be with regard to different classes of men; but there is an essential diversity of principle between those who would class women, as to personal rights, with children, who are necessarily in a state of tutelage, and those who would class them with men, who are dealt with as competent to direct their own actions and affairs. The question at issue between Mr. MILL and Mr. STEPHEN in this controversy is simply whether women are human beings with the full rights and responsibilities of humanity, or whether they are a superior kind of inferior beings, whose personal rights and duties must be regarded as subordinate to those of men. Whether, in fact, the ludicrous misapplication which is so commonly made, both in jest and earnest, of the phrase “lords of the creation,” by using it with reference to the male sex instead of to the human race, is to be the rule on which the relative political and social position of the two sexes of humanity is to be based.

Mr. STEPHEN'S proposition is that society and government ought to recognise inequality of sex as the foundation of inequality of rights. He illustrates this proposition by stating that if we were engaged in a great war it might be necessary to have a conscription both for land and sea service. He asks, “ought men and women to be subject to it indiscriminately?” and he implies that an answer in the negative should be taken as a confirmation of his proposition. But the question cannot be reduced to such a narrow issue. In case of a conscription men would not be subject to it *indiscriminately*, the maimed, the blind, the halt, and the aged would be exempt, at least, until all the able-bodied had been called out. Yet no one proposes to recognise a difference in the personal rights of able-bodied and infirm men, based on their liability to compulsory military service. In the next place, a conscription could only take place in a great national emergency, and, in such a crisis, women equally with men would be called upon to devote themselves to the service of their country, both by contributing the sinews of war, and by personal exertion and risk of some kind. There are more kinds of service, even of

military service, than actual bearing of arms, and more kinds of force, even in warfare, than material force. When NELSON joined the fleet at Trafalgar he added one to its numerical strength, yet the frail one-armed man brought moral force so great, that it was said that every ship was doubly manned from that instant. When France lay prostrate at the feet of England's king, a woman brought force enough to an army and a nation to enable them to repel the invader; and though this be the age and France the land of pilgrimages to the scene of supernatural revelations said to have been vouchsafed to women, we may be pardoned for believing that the spirit which inspired the MAID OF ORLEANS was the womanly spirit of courage, patriotism, and self-devotion, that this spirit is of no particular age or country; and that in any great crisis touching the life of the nation the daughters of England, as well as her sons, would bear an equal if not a similar part in the services and the sacrifices which the nation as a whole was called upon to render. It would be as reasonable to say that because men do not hazard their lives in the duties of maternity they ought to be deprived of political rights, as to say that because women are not called upon to run the risk of being shot in the service of the country they are therefore not to be counted as citizens. As a matter of fact, we understand that the per centage of women who lose their lives in the dangers incident to them in the profession of marriage exceeds the per centage of soldiers killed in battle. Why should the risk of life be thought so honourable and heroic in the one sex as to form the basis for claiming a monopoly of a voice in the government, and so little worthy of honour in the other that the mere liability to be called upon to enter the condition of life which demands it is to be held as a permanent disqualification for the exercise of political rights?

(To be continued.)

### ELECTION INTELLIGENCE.

#### DOVER.

The cause of women's suffrage gains a vote at Dover by the election of Mr. Barnett, who was elected on September 22nd in the place of Sir George Jessel. The latter gentleman formerly voted against the Women's Disabilities Bill, but latterly has preserved neutrality on the question. We take this opportunity of acknowledging the valuable service rendered to the cause of the Amendment of the Law Respecting the Property of Married Women by the Ex-Solicitor-General, both by speech and vote in the House of Commons.

A correspondent at Dover sends us a copy of the following letter, which was addressed by Mr. Barnett in reply to one from the honorary secretary of the Women's Suffrage Com-

mittee in that place a short time ago:—"Sir,—I must apologise for not having replied to your letter of the 7th ult., but I was in hopes of being able to see you personally on the interesting subject to which your letter under reply has reference. I have duly perused the pamphlets you so kindly sent me, which only tend to confirm the opinion I have always entertained on the subject of "Women's Rights." The right of women to vote at municipal elections was a step towards removing their political disabilities. No one has had reason to complain of that step having been taken; on the contrary, every one has, I believe, become convinced of its wisdom. I therefore fail to see why a further step should not now be taken, and a further disability removed by admitting them to exercise their vote at Parliamentary elections, and any measure brought forward with this object in view will receive my support in the House of Commons whenever the time may arrive enabling me to exercise such power. You are quite at liberty to communicate this to your committee.—I remain, Sir, yours faithfully,  
E. W. BARNETT."

The reply of Mr. Forbes was not nearly so satisfactory, and indeed not altogether intelligible; but since he was defeated his views are not of so much immediate importance. Major Dickson, the senior member for Dover, is a steady supporter of the Women's Disabilities Removal Bill.

#### BATH.

The death of Dr. Dalrymple has again thrown this city into the excitement of a contested election, the third within six months. It is remarkable that both its Parliamentary representatives should have been called away by death within so short a period. Both parties are prepared with candidates, and the views both of Captain Hayter and Mr. Forsyth have been so recently laid before the readers of the *Journal* that it is only necessary to say that Captain Hayter does not see his way to support Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill, and that Mr. Forsyth, Q.C., after a careful perusal of the Parliamentary debate on the question in *Hansard*, arrived at the conclusion that it was a just measure, and that he would vote for it.

### SUMMER LECTURES.

#### MATLOCK BRIDGE.

On August 28th Miss Becker lectured at Matlock Bridge. The audience was earnest and attentive, and the lecture was received with great interest. Votes of thanks to the lecturer, and to the chairman (a gentleman from Burnley), were accorded at the close of the lecture.

#### BUXTON.

On August 29th Miss Becker gave an address in the Assembly Room of the Crescent Hotel, on "The Political Disabilities of Women: Their Legal and Social Consequences." There was a large and "fashionable" attendance, the chair being taken by Lord Houghton, who commenced the proceedings with some very apt remarks. The greatest interest was excited, and a cordial vote of thanks was passed at the conclusion. Judging from the animated conversations which ensued, as the groups of hearers filed off to their respective hotels, there can be no doubt that Miss Becker has given "the cause" a forward movement, and that those who went to chaff and laugh are inclined to look on this important question more seriously.—*Abridged from the Buxton Advertiser.*

#### CHESTER.

On September 1st an address on "The Political Disabilities of women: their legal and social consequences," was delivered

at the Town Hall, by Miss Becker, on behalf of the Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage. There was a tolerably fair attendance, and Mr. J. Brown was voted to the chair.—The Chairman, in opening the meeting, said he differed from Miss Becker's views, but he thought she was entitled to an impartial hearing. He had no doubt the lecture would be instructive and entertaining, and that their knowledge of women's rights would be much increased by it.—Miss Becker, who was most favourably received, then proceeded to deliver her address, at the conclusion of which she resumed her seat amidst loud applause.—The Chairman said Miss Becker was prepared to answer any questions.—A gentleman in the body of the hall asked Miss Becker if it was proposed to give the franchise to married women.—Miss Becker replied that it was proposed to give a vote to women who were property owners, or who paid rates and taxes in their own names. (Hear, hear.) The Chairman, in eulogistic terms, proposed a vote of thanks to Miss Becker.—The Rev. Mr. Montgomery, in cordially seconding the motion, fully endorsed Miss Becker's arguments as to the desirability of extending the franchise to women, but dissented somewhat from her statement that the education of girls was inferior to that of boys in elementary schools. That was not his experience in Chester.—Miss Becker still adhered to her argument, which she supported by citing her experience on the Manchester School Board.—The vote of thanks was passed with acclamation, and the proceedings terminated.—The Chester papers contained extended reports of the lecture, and three of them had articles commenting favourably on the views advanced.

#### CARNARVON.

An address was delivered by Miss Becker, on September 2nd, in the National School Room, Carnarvon. The chair was occupied by the Rev. H. T. Edwards, Vicar of Carnarvon, and there was a good attendance, although the lecture here, as in other places in the district, was given in a language foreign to that of the general population. The address was received with great interest, and the usual votes of thanks concluded the proceedings.

#### BANGOR.

On September 3rd a lecture was delivered by Miss Becker, in the Penrhyn Hall, Bangor, on behalf of the Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage. Mr. Price, the vice-principal of the Bangor Normal College, occupied the chair, and in introducing the lecturer to her audience, expressed himself in favour of the principles she advocated. The lecture occupied a little more than half an hour in delivery. At its close the usual compliments were passed, on the motion of Mr. James and Mr. Foulkes.—*Abridged from the North Wales Chronicle.*

#### RHYL.

On September 4th, an address was delivered at the Town Hall, Rhyl, on the "Political disabilities of women: their social and legal consequences," by Miss Becker. At eight o'clock, the time announced for commencing, there were not many present, but eventually the hall became pretty well filled. The Rev. Isaac Jones proposed, and it was carried, that the Rev. John Turnbull take the chair. Miss Becker then rose, being received with much applause by the audience. At the close of the lecture, the Rev. Isaac Jones, who was on the platform, rose to propose a vote of thanks to Miss Becker; who said that those on the platform did not necessarily commit themselves to her views. But he had no hesitation in saying that he was committed to her views, long ago, and promised to do all in his power to support the measure she advocated. Mr. Bishop, photographer, seconded the proposal very warmly.

The motion was passed unanimously, and Miss Becker, in replying, thanked all for their attendance and patient hearing, and moved a vote of thanks to the chairman. Mr. Debney seconded this, which brought the meeting to a close.—*Abridged from the Rhyl Journal.*

#### LLANDUDNO.

Miss Becker addressed a large and select audience at the St. George's Hall, Llandudno, on September 8th, her subject being "The Political Disabilities of Women; their social and legal consequences." The chair was occupied by Mr. Thomas. The address was received with loud applause; and the usual vote of thanks having been heartily accorded to the lecturer and the chairman, the meeting terminated.—*Abridged from the Llandudno Register and Herald.*

#### MARGATE.

On September 16th, an address, under the auspices of the National Society for Women's Suffrage, was delivered in St. John's Hall, Hawley-square, by Miss Fenwick Miller, of London. At half-past seven the Vicar entered the room and conducted the lady lecturer to the platform, the Vicar presiding at the proceedings.—The Vicar, in introducing Miss Miller to the meeting, alluded to that man as a brute who said that a woman might ride outside an omnibus in the rain because she was an advocate of woman's rights, and then proceeded to remark that there was no doubt that in this country the ladies were the educators of the nation. He observed that it did not follow because he was there that night that he was an advocate of women's suffrage. There was a time when he was not very warm for it, and his wife did not like it a bit. (Laughter.) But his opinion now, as far as he had gone into it, was in favour of this movement, and at all events he should always be glad to take the chair at such meetings as the present, because it was a subject that ought to be ventilated and well considered, whatever the decision arrived at. They ought to hear what was to be said in its favour, and if they found it reasonable, then whatever their opinions were, they did not mind changing them. Perhaps there was one caveat that he might enter here. Some might perhaps think that this was some rabid political movement. In fact he believed this movement had in some way been identified with Radicalism. Now it so happened that it was shown in the papers distributed amongst the audience that it was by no means confined to one party, because while on the one hand they had the two Brights and Professor Fawcett, on the other hand they had Mr. Disraeli, who was a warm advocate of the movement. Here was therefore the leader of the Conservative party advocating the women's suffrage. All things considered, he thought he might say that in considering that question they would steer clear of politics and go into the merits of the question.—Miss Miller then delivered her address, at the conclusion of which she was loudly applauded. At the invitation of the chairman, Mr. Alderman Pickering made some remarks, and was followed by Mr. W. S. Jones, of London. Both gentlemen supported the claims of women to the suffrage, but their comments were chiefly directed to the statements of the lecturer with regard to the laws affecting women.—Miss Miller replied to the observations, and after a vote of thanks to the chairman, the meeting separated.—*Abridged from Koble's Gazette.*

#### RAMSGATE.

On September 17th, a most able and eloquent address was delivered in St. James's Hall, Ramsgate, by Miss Fenwick Miller, under the auspices of the National Society for Women's Suffrage. The chair was taken by Dr. Henderson, who, on introducing Miss Miller, remarked that he thought the subject of women's suffrage was a new thing in Ramsgate, and that he

was glad to see so good an audience. He remarked that it did seem anomalous that in this country women possessing large estates and property should be placed in a position of inferiority to their own servants and dependants, who possessed the franchise, but they themselves were denied the privilege simply on account of their sex. Such an anomalous state of things, he thought, should no longer exist, and they ought to use their influence to rectify it. He, like the audience, had come to hear and to learn of a woman the real state of the question. He then called on Miss Fenwick Miller to deliver her address. Miss Fenwick Miller, on rising, was loudly applauded. The subject was divided into four heads:—1st. That the laws governing women are not impartial and just. 2nd. That giving to women the Parliamentary franchise would eventually amend this. 3rd. That questions of national interest should be considered by the whole nation, and would be better decided; and 4th. That there exists no valid objection to giving the suffrage to women who are otherwise qualified. The address dealt with these propositions in an able and comprehensive manner, and was received with cheers. The chairman then said that Miss Miller had wished him to say that if anyone present desired to speak on the subject, and to favour her and them with any remarks, they were at liberty to do so. He thought from what they had heard that evening that some of the arguments must go home to their hearts and minds, and that they must admit that we in this country had laws on our statute book which ought long since to have been repealed. He was sure that some of them present had just heard what they had not heard before, and that the authorities, facts, and arguments which had been adduced they could digest; and he also hoped they would use their influence in the coming election to promote the objects of the society, so as to enable our women who pay rates and taxes to exercise the franchise. As no one responded to the invitation to speak on the subject, he then proposed a vote of thanks to the young lady for giving them so interesting a lecture on that occasion.—This was seconded by Mr. H. G. Vinten, and warmly accorded.—Miss Miller, in a few words, gracefully acknowledged the compliment, and proposed a vote of thanks to Dr. Henderson for having so kindly presided.—This was seconded by Mr. H. Hinds, and carried *nem con.* The meeting then dispersed, a collection being made at the doors.—*Abridged from the Thanet Advertiser.*

## LYNTON.

A lecture was delivered by Miss Helena Downing, of London, on September 16th, in the Club Room, Lynton. The attendance was small; but the lecture was listened to throughout with much interest.

## ILFRACOMBE.

A meeting was held on September 17th, in the Music Hall, under the auspices of the Bristol and West of England Society for Women's Suffrage, the object of which is to obtain for women the right of voting for members of Parliament on a par with men. Miss Downing, of London, attended to advocate the objects of the society. The chair had been announced to be taken at eight o'clock, and at the appointed hour the Rev. S. Lewin, who introduced the lecturer, said he was not a self-appointed chairman, but was there by accident. He had endeavoured to secure a chairman, and had called among others on Mr. Vye, the resident magistrate, who would have taken the chair but for a previous engagement, as the movement was one in which he felt interested. The lady who was about to address them was not a self-constituted lecturer, but was there under the sanction of the National Society for Women's Suffrage. She was the niece of Mr. McArthur Downing, M.P. for the county

of Cork. The rev. gentleman then briefly dwelt upon the various phases of the subject, after which he introduced Miss Downing to the assembly. At the conclusion of her address, Miss Downing, in reply to a question, said Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill did not propose to give the suffrage to married women, but to the unmarried possessing the necessary qualifications and standing. This concluded the proceedings, throughout which marked attention was manifested by the audience. There was not so large an attendance as had been expected.—*Abridged from the Ilfracombe Chronicle.*

## TEIGNMOUTH.

An address on "The Political Disabilities of Women; their Legal and Social Consequences," was given by Miss Downing, of London, on September 18th, at the Athenæum. The chair was taken by Mr. Brown, of Bishopsteignton, who briefly introduced the speaker.—Miss Downing commenced by stating that conservatism seemed so deeply rooted in the heart of man that an almost religious reverence is created for all customs that have antiquity for their support. The opposition to women's suffrage sprang principally from feeling, and not from reason. The advocates of women's suffrage asked simply that women who occupy houses and pay rates should be entitled in the same way as men to vote for members of Parliament, and that the fundamental principle of the British Constitution that "taxation and representation go together" should not be ignored because it happens to be a woman and not a man who pays the taxes. It had been said by some that if women had votes they must take the responsibilities of citizens and be prepared to fight in battle. Old men and feeble men, clergymen and doctors should be deprived of their votes if the names of citizens and soldiers were synonymous. The lecturer concluded her address by saying that it was not solely a woman's question, for whatever tended to depress and lower the woman's position must have an injurious effect on man, and whatever tended to deepen her sense of personal responsibility, could not fail to have a beneficial influence on the whole human race. This is so evident that it may be taken as an axiom, that in whatever country woman is placed nearest on an equality with man, just in proportion will that country be in advance of others in civilization. Compare the history of nations, ancient and modern, and the conclusion will be arrived at that in public government as in private, in large affairs as in small, in great questions as in narrow ones "it is not good for man to be alone." Mrs. Brine made a few remarks in support of the question, and on the motion of the chairman thanks of the meeting were given to the ladies who had addressed them.—*Abridged from the Teignmouth Times.*

## DAWLISH.

A lecture was delivered in the Royal Hotel Assembly Rooms, on September 19th, by Miss Helena Downing. The attendance was good, consisting almost entirely of visitors. The chair was taken by Mr. Gay. The Rev. R. Hall, and other gentlemen present, also spoke in favour of the objects of the meeting. Much interest was shown by the audience in the able advocacy of the cause by Miss Downing.

## CLEVEDON.

An address was delivered by Miss Downing, in the Public Hall, at eight o'clock, on September 22nd. The chair was occupied by Mr. Edmund Candy. There was a moderate attendance, and the lecturer was favourably received. Mr. Alan Grenwell proposed a vote of thanks to the lecturer and the chairman, which concluded the proceedings. At this meeting a petition was signed by several of the audience, in support of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill.

## SCOTLAND.

## RENFREW.

Miss S. Massingberd Mundy delivered an address in the Freemasons' Hall, Renfrew, on the evening of the 21st August. Mr. Glen presiding. After some discussion, a resolution to petition Parliament in favour of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill was carried, with three dissentients.

## ARDROSSAN.

On Friday night, August 22nd, Miss S. Massingberd Mundy delivered a lecture in the Town Hall, Ardrossan, on the women's suffrage question. Mr. J. L. Bailey occupied the chair, and in the course of his remarks, when introducing Miss Mundy to the audience, said that taxation without representation was a breach of the principle which had been, in theory at least, admitted ever since the days of Runnymede and Magna Charta. At the close of the lecture the following resolution was proposed by Mr. Guthrie, publisher:—"That, as taxation is the basis of representation in this country, it is unjust in principle to withhold it from duly qualified persons on the ground of sex: therefore this meeting authorise the chairman to sign a petition in favour of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill to remove the electoral disabilities of women, and to forward the same to both Houses of Parliament at the proper time." This was seconded by Mr. Young, and unanimously agreed to.—*Ardrossan Herald.*

## POLLOKSHAW.

A public meeting was held in the Town Hall, Pollokshaws, on Monday evening, August 25th, on behalf of the Scottish National Society for Women's Suffrage. Bailie Paterson occupied the chair. Miss S. M. Mundy effectively advocated the extension of the electoral franchise to women, and at the close of the lecture, which was very attentively listened to, Mr. Brown moved, and Mr. McKinnon seconded, the following resolution:—"That this meeting, thinking it not only just, but important for national wellbeing, that women who possess the electoral qualification should be represented in the election of members of Parliament, authorise the Chairman to sign a petition on behalf of the meeting in support of the Bill of Mr. Jacob Bright, M.P., for the same."—The motion was unanimously carried.—A vote of thanks was given to the Chairman, and the meeting separated.—*Glasgow Herald.*

## LERWICK.

A public meeting was held in the Lecture Hall, Mount Hooley Street, Lerwick, on September 19th, for the purpose of hearing an address from Miss Taylour, Edinburgh, late of Belmont, on women's suffrage. There was a good attendance. Miss Taylour was accompanied by Miss Agnes McLaren, daughter of Mr. Duncan McLaren, M.P. for Edinburgh. On the motion of the Rev. Andrew Macfarlane, Bailie Robertson was asked to take the chair. After the address, during the delivery of which Miss Taylour was frequently interrupted with applause, resolutions in support of women's suffrage were moved and seconded by Bailie Robertson, Rev. Mr. Macfarlane, Dr. Cowie, the Rev. Mr. Dibson, and Mr. H. Morrison; and a committee was appointed to promote the cause of women's suffrage in Shetland; the committee to consist of Rev. Andrew Macfarlane, Mrs. Macfarlane, Rev. Robert Walker, A.M., Robert Cowie, Esq., A.M., M.D., Mrs. Cowie, Miss Ogilvie, Miss Spence, John Robertson, Esq., Mrs. Robertson, Mr. Morrison, Rev. J. E. Dobson, Mrs. Dobson, with power to add to their number.—Miss McLaren then proposed a vote of thanks to Bailie Robertson, at the same time sketching the rise and progress of the women's suffrage movement, and concluded by trusting the committee now formed would aid them in their endeavours to obtain what they considered their rights.—*Shetland Times.*

## WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE IN VICTORIA.

## MELBOURNE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

TUESDAY, JULY 8, 1873.

The PRESIDENT took the chair at half-past four o'clock.

## ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The House went into committee to consider this Bill.

On clause 6, electors for Assembly,

Mr. RICHARDSON moved that the word "male" be omitted. The effect would be to entitle female ratepayers to vote. Women who were ratepayers were entitled to vote at municipal elections, and he contended that they were entitled to vote at elections for the Assembly. They were efficient members of boards of advice.

Mr. FRANCIS said that whatever regard he had for the female sex, he thought that their qualifications were already sufficiently charming without adding to their influence in society by conferring on them the right to vote for members of the Legislature. The happiness of families would be interfered with, and even the harmony of elections would be lessened when ladies rushed to the poll in an excited state to vote. He thought the first considerations of society rendered it necessary to restrict the franchise to the head of the house.

Mr. G. V. SMITH could not see why, if persons were allowed to vote because they were ratepayers, women who were ratepayers should not have the franchise; but he thought we should hesitate to adopt the principle until we obtained some experience of legislation on the subject. The experiment was under trial in the territory of Wyoming.

Mr. LONGMORE supported the amendment. The objection of the hon. member for the Ovens reminded him of the Irishman who would not enter the water until he had learned to swim.

Mr. WOODS said that Chinamen voted at the last general election, and if the ladies of the colony were not fit to vote they would have to strike off the Chinamen.

Mr. HIGINBOTHAM said he did not know how it happened that this question, wherever it was discussed, appeared to excite more mirth than deliberation. Some hon. members seemed to feel a sense of uneasiness and alarm when discussions of this kind came on. He regarded the question as a very important one. If votes were accorded to women as they now were to men, although the practice might in some instances introduce divisions into families, it would tend to introduce manners into the Legislature, and sometimes to civilise its proceedings, and communicate to them a stream of moderate feeling and common sense which occasionally, perhaps, discussions even in public might be deficient in. The present proposal was a step in the direction of placing women on an equality with men, and in that view was a desirable one to take. No doubt the withholding of this right from women was a badge and the result of the degraded condition of the sex—(no, no),—and the vast number of blandishments and compliments which were paid to the female sex was a further indication of the same feeling. He confessed, however, that he joined most heartily in the wish that in the vast number of instances they would never exercise political power. But even although a large number of women might be so interested in their family and domestic affairs that they would not care to take an active part in politics, the withholding the right from those who had not family ties, and who might like to take an interest in politics, was, it seemed to him, a badge of the inferior position of the sex, and something should be done to remove it.

Mr. M'LELLAN ventured to remind the committee that St. Paul, a great authority upon this subject, had remarked:—

"Let your women keep silence in the churches, for it is not permitted unto them to speak: but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church." (Much laughter.)

Mr. VALE thought that in discussing this subject it should not be forgotten that the present Sovereign of Great Britain was a woman. It was possible that if the franchise were extended to the other sex it might effect an important change in the constitution of the House, for a good many of the present members, on account of their bad looks, might have to give place to handsomer fellows. (Laughter.) Ere long, he thought, men would have to recognise women as their equals. A large number of women in power and capacity to reason out political questions were far in advance of a large number of men who proudly wielded the franchise, and ignobly boasted a superiority which they really did not possess. Naturally women had all the interest in good government that men had. Were they to attain political power, their influence upon legislation upon certain subjects would be marked. There was very little doubt women would not then continue to receive one-third the remuneration paid to men for services rendered. If they could exercise an influence in proportion to their numerical strength, he ventured to say that capacity to do public work would be the measure of payment for public work done, and that the question whether it was performed by men in breeches or women in petticoats would have nothing to do with it.

Mr. JONES said he was prepared to extend the political franchise to women already entitled to exercise it in municipal matters. He would strike out the word "male" in order not to disfranchise females, but he was not prepared to go any further at present.

Mr. MACPHERSON remarked that if he were persuaded that a considerable number of women in the country desired representation, he would feel compelled to advocate it, but he felt convinced that if the colony were polled, nine-tenths of the whole—almost every woman worthy of the name of woman—would vote against it. The mothers as a body would do so. If women householders were allowed to vote, on what ground could they be prevented from representing constituencies? It was said that men had no right to draw distinctions between the sexes, but nature had drawn distinctions that could not be ignored—that it would be foolish to ignore—and, therefore, it was much better to leave the representation as it stood.

Mr. L. L. SMITH supported the amendment. He considered that already a good many old women obtained seats in the Legislature. (Laughter.)

Mr. PURVES pointed out that alarming results might flow from this debate. A commotion at the household breakfast table to-morrow morning might be the consequence of the utterances of some hon. members to-night. Those most ready to admit the equality of the sexes in the Legislature might dispute it in their households. (Laughter.)

Mr. PHILLIPS did not see how anyone could logically object to women having the franchise.

Mr. F. L. SMYTH said the movement in favour of giving women the franchise was progressing in England, and that the late Sir Robert Peel and Mr. Disraeli were in favour of it. The amendment, if carried, would only give ratepaying women the right of voting in respect of their property. When the East India Company was in existence, female shareholders in it were allowed to vote for directors, who governed millions of men. He should vote for the amendment.

Mr. BURTT supported the amendment, expressing it as his opinion that women excel in everything.

Mr. PATTERSON also supported the amendment. There was

a greater mental difference of opinion between men and men than between men and women. Women were allowed to vote for members of local governing bodies, but they never attempted to attain to the position of mayor.

Mr. WRIXON said that the amendment did not raise the woman's rights question. It only proposed to extend the franchise to female ratepayers who had no one to vote for them. The passing of the amendment would only have a trifling effect. He would vote for it.

The committee divided on the question, that the word "male" stand part of the clause with the following result:—

Ayes	...	...	...	...	33
Noes	...	...	...	...	35

Majority for the amendment... 2

The announcement of the result of the division was received with cheers.

The following is the division list:—

AYES.		
Mr. Bates	Mr. Kerferd	Mr. Plummer
— Casey	— King	— Purves
— Clarke, W.	— Langton	— Ramsay
— Cohen	— Lobb	— Robertson
— Crews	— MacBain	— Smith, G. V.
— Cunningham	— Mackay	— Stephen
— Francis	— Macpherson	— Stewart
— Fraser	— M'Lellan	— Thomas
— Garratt	— Montgomery	— Walsh, F.
— Gillies	— Moore	— Walsh, R.
— James	— Orr	— Watkins

  

NOES.		
Mr. Bales	Mr. Higginbotham	Mr. Richardson
— Bent	— Johnstone	— Riddell
— Berry	— Jones	— Smith, L. L.
— Burrows	— Levien	— Smith, Murray
— Burt	— Longmore	— Smyth, F. L.
— Clark, A. T.	— Macgregor	— Vale
— Curtain	— Mason	— Walker
Sir C. G. Duffy	— M'Kenna	— Wilson
Mr. Farrell	— Must	— Woods
— Ferguson	— O'Grady	— Wrixon
— Hanna	— Patterson	— Zeal
— Harker	— Philipps	

Melbourne Argus.

WOMEN AND PARLIAMENTARY CANDIDATES.—It has sometimes been alleged that if women possessed the franchise they would give their votes to candidates because of their good looks. We extract from the *Glasgow Herald* the following account of the experience of one of the candidates for Dumfries which seems to belie that assumption. "Mr. Scott said there were a number of houses he knew that Mr. Villiers visited when the husbands were not in, and he told the mistresses he had come to let himself be seen—(laughter)—and that they were to take a proper look at him—(loud laughter)—so that they might tell their husbands what they really thought of his appearance. (Laughter.) The answer he got from some of the ladies was that so far as his outward appearance went he looked very well—(laughter)—but that his success depended on his principles and not on his outward appearance at all—and so he went out of the houses and did not solicit votes."

A MEMORIAL VOLUME OF SACRED POETRY, by the late Sir John Bowring, to which is prefixed a Memoir of the Author by Lady Bowring, is in the press. The volume, which includes many of the Author's best known hymns, will be published by Messrs. Longmans & Co., of Paternoster Row, London.

### LADIES, WOMEN, AND POLITICS.

The *Examiner*, commenting on the course taken by the Dowager Marchioness of Westminster, with regard to the recent election in Shaftesbury, says:—

Those who advocate the right of women to a voice in political affairs are frequently told that politics are not women's business, that women neither can nor ought to have any opinions on politics, that any interference in politics will inevitably degrade women and brutalise them. Women's sphere in medicine, the *Lancet* lately told us, "should certainly be limited to the carrying out of the desires and implicitly obeying the dictates" of men; and it is not in medicine alone, but over the whole field of human action, that this theory of feminine serfdom is held to be true. But here we have a woman—for, strange as it may seem to the bucolic mind of Motcombe, a marchioness is a woman—interfering in a political contest, and perhaps deciding that contest. Nay more, this lady is so persuaded of her right to have political opinions, and act upon them, that she is not content with regulating her own convictions and "influencing" those of her tenants, but her son, a man of thirty-six years, a member of Parliament and of the Government, is accused of breaking the fifth commandment because he ventures to differ from his mother's Tory views. The influence exercised by women of the "upper classes" in political affairs receives apt illustration by this incident; but, in truth, it was very well known before. It is patent to all those who are at all acquainted with the personal history of politics, that the women—we beg pardon, ladies—of the ruling families take a very active, and sometimes very effective, part in the national business. It ought not to surprise anybody that the opponents of the right of women to the franchise have no word of condemnation for this. What they dislike is not that ladies shall exercise a sinister back-stairs influence, but that women should be entrusted with a political right, and called upon to exercise it in an open and responsible way. Poor Mr. Seymour acknowledges the right of the marchioness to "influence" her tenants in favour of the Tory candidate, though peers are by law excluded from interfering in Parliamentary elections; and confines himself to mildly deprecating "coercion." Those who plead against the injustice of denying to women, because they are women, a voice in the direction of affairs in which they have the same interest as men, are commonly called "mere theorists" and doctrinaires. But if those who advocate the permanent subjection of one half of the human race to the other half would only for a few days take off the spectacles of prejudice through which they view society and look at it as it actually is, they would have to acknowledge that it is they who have evolved their facts from their own longings. What is the use of telling us that politics are without the sphere of woman, when—apart from the assumption involved in this, that we have the right to determine woman's sphere for her—it is a positive fact that women take part in politics, the law giving to one lady the highest political post in the nation, and society recognising the political action of many others? Why plead that political life would rob woman of her graces of manner when the part she at present takes, and cannot be prevented from taking, in politics, is one that is necessarily degrading, while one of the chief recommendations of the franchise which is asked for her and by her is its elevating effect on those who possess it? We have only to use our powers of observation on the circumstances which are going on in our every-day life to be convinced that the evils which are prophesied as a result of the political enfranchisement of women are now resulting from the intrigues of unenfranchised ladies, and that no surer method of purifying the political world of those intrigues could be

devised than by infusing into it that feeling of duty which, when not counteracted by other institutions, representative government always brings with it.

### GALLANTRY *versus* RESPECT.

Mrs. Child, the popular American authoress, has the following remarks in a recent number of the *Woman's Journal*, published in Boston, Massachusetts:—

It has been recently discussed in your columns whether when women have an equal share with men in public affairs they will be treated by men with as much gallantry as they have been hitherto. I hope and trust not. I despise gallantry as I despise all things not genuine. I would have courteous and polite attentions offered to women for the same reasons that they are offered to men; and for no other reasons. If a woman apparently not strong in health, or a woman with an infant in her arms, enters an omnibus, any truly kind-hearted man would offer her his seat if no other was empty. And if an old man, or an invalid entered a crowded omnibus, any good-hearted woman would relinquish her seat for his accommodation. When I was young, gentlemen sometimes made room for me in a carriage with the remark, "I always give place to the ladies;" and even in those unreflecting days the phrase always rung hollow in my ears. But this spring, when I was on my way to Boston Highlands in a crowded omnibus, a young girl insisted upon giving up her seat to me, and resisted all my entreaties that she would sit in my lap. I knew that she did it because she saw I was old and apparently tired; and I felt sure she had a heart that would have made her equally courteous to an old man. I loved that girl on the spot, because I trusted in her nature as something genuine; and if I had been seeking to adopt a daughter, I would have chosen her from a thousand. But what is there in the mere gallantries of custom to commend them to the respect or gratitude of sensible women? They are generally more or less tinged with contempt, or, at the best, with humiliating condescension. Hazlitt says: "It is not easy to keep up conversation with women in company. It is thought rudeness to differ from them, and it is not quite fair to ask them a reason for what they say." A woman must have very little of the virago in her composition, if her cheeks do not flush, and her eyes flash at such gallantry as that! In reading Bulwer's "Parisians," I smiled with pleasure at the following line: "He gave her an earnest sympathizing look wholly free from the impertinence of gallantry." Moreover, there is in the basis of gallantry something worse than kindly condescension of conscious superiority; worse even than a flimsy veiled contempt for inferiority. It is so often the expression of sensual adulation to the persons of women, that all dictionaries give the word this double definition: "Polite attention to ladies; vicious love; debauchery." And we always find a nation noted for profligacy in the same ratio that it is distinguished for gallantry. France is a pre-eminent example of this. Nowhere is gallantry of manners carried to such graceful perfection, and nowhere do the habits and literature of a people so reek with impurity. I repeat, it will be a great gain for women when this gilded counterfeit coin ceases to be current, and is superseded by the genuine gold of respectful human sympathy shared alike by the brethren and sisters of mankind.

L. MARIA CHILD.

MILL MEMORIAL.—We have received and forwarded to the treasurer of the Mill Memorial Fund the following sums. The donors have requested that they be applied to the foundation of scholarships. Miss Rosa Hall, £1. 1s.; Mrs. Wade, 2s. 6d.; Miss Wade, 2s. 6d.

A CRY FOR JUSTICE.

Women of England, weep! Who are slaves in the land of the free, Who till that others may reap, Whose sorrow is others' glee.

Would ye live? There is labour for some, But others will gain the good. Would ye die? Well, perhaps, there is room For one more corpse in the flood.

Are ye fair? There are pleasures by sin, Ye may queen it awhile over lust. Are ye ugly? Ye scarce may win A place to die in the dust.

Are ye noble or rich? Ye are queens, But 'tis title or wealth men adore. Are ye humble? Like mere machines Ye must toil for your pittance poor.

Oh, ages of chivalry fled! We mourn that ye come not again; Oh knights of chivalry dead! Arise and defend us amain!

For we learned the lesson of old, To obey is the woman's part; And we followed where we were told, And wholly yielded our heart?

But if this be the woman's law, Is the law on the man not laid, To honour the woman and draw Her by love to honour the head?

We have followed, and we have obeyed, But where is our honour in turn? Should we yield us for man to degrade, Our obedience and honour to spurn?

Men of England, we ask but our due, And ours is the righteous cause; We will strive till our voice be a power, To change and to frame the laws.

Our weapons they are not of steel, But hard and trusty are they; With them we will strive till ye feel, We are purposed to win our way.

CHASTELAR.

THE WILL OF THE LATE MR. JOHN STUART MILL.—It appears by his will, dated 23rd of May, 1853, Mr. John Stuart Mill nominates Miss Taylor his literary executor, with full power to edit all or any of his literary works, and to publish all or any of his manuscripts as she may think fit. As regards his biography, the following expressions occur: "And whereas in these days no one is secure against attempts to make money by means of pretended biographies, I therefore think it necessary to state that I have written a short account of my life, which I leave to the absolute charge of my said step-daughter, Miss Helen Taylor, to be published or not at her will and discretion, and, in the event of her death in my lifetime, to the charge and control of William Thomas Thornton, on condition that he publishes the same within two years of my decease. And I hereby declare that all papers and materials available

for an account of my life are in possession of my said step-daughter, and of her only, and that no other person has such knowledge of either my literary or private life as would qualify him or her to write my biography." In the event of Miss Taylor predeceasing him, he nominates Mr. W. T. Thornton and Mr. W. Ellis as his executors, and disposes of his effects as follows: To members of his wife's family and his own he leaves legacies to the amount of £9,000; to the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, £500; to the Land Tenure Reform Association, £500; to any one University in Great Britain or Ireland that shall be the first to open its degrees to women, £3,000; and to the same university a further sum of £3,000, to endow scholarships for female students exclusively. His copyrights he bequeaths in trust to Mr. John Morley, to be applied in aid of some periodical publication which shall be open to the expression of all opinions, and which shall have all its articles signed with the names of the writers. The property left by Mr. Mill is sworn under £14,000.

PETITIONS.

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY ACT (1870) AMENDMENT BILL.—IN FAVOUR.

Table listing petitions for the Married Women's Property Act (1870) Amendment Bill. Includes entries for Leeds, Archenfield, Dublin, Rathmines, W. Burton, James MacTaggart, Manchester, Salford, Bristol, Huddersfield, Finsbury, Liverpool, Richard Williams, E. W. Wood, W. G. Ashford, Devonport, Birmingham, Thomas Smith, Mary Hall, Eliza Haynes, Elizabeth Dracup, George Edgar, William Hazlehurst, Inhabitants of Holbeck, Salford, Hannah Davies, Inhabitants of Stretford, John Jones, Matthew Tintell, Arabella Scholefield, Samuel Turnpenny, and George Windham.

Table listing petitions for women's suffrage. Includes entries for William Bonner, Emma Buck, Richard Dix, B. L. Stenning, Charles Cusani, John Travis, Inhabitants of Brimscombe, Belfast, Plymouth, Charles Ford, Inhabitants of Manchester, Salford, Elizabeth Miller, Martha Eastwood, Louisa Collimore, Inhabitants of Salford, Port Madoc, Kensington, Bath, Bethnal Green, Pentonville, Highgate, Aldersgate Street, Kensington, Inhabitants of Manchester, North Wootton, Belfast, Kate Griffiths, Eliza Tolme, Inhabitants of Bognor, Bath, Salford, Thomas Bakewell, George Gynne, Inhabitants of Battersea, Surbiton, Saint Helens, Salford, Manchester, Bath, Salford, Dublin, Caroline Stansfeld, Inhabitants of Bath, Salford, Sarah Muggleworth, Inhabitants of Birmingham, Bridgewater, Bath, Putney, Salford, Illington, George Turner, Inhabitants of Lambeth, Upper Norwood, Manchester, Inhabitants of Manchester, Bath, Manchester, Wilmslow, Southport, West Bromwich, and Ballspod.

Table listing petitions for Warrenstown and other places, Brighton, Alfred Tucker, Inhabitants of Belfast, Letitia Tennant, Inhabitants of Liverpool, and Holbeck.

Total number of Petitions 245—Signatures 32,313. The petitions marked † have the addresses of some or all of the petitioners affixed.

THE PROPERTY OF MARRIED WOMEN.—The Annual Meeting of Members and friends of the Committee for Amending the Law with respect to the Property of Married Women will be held in the Town Hall, Manchester, on Monday, October 20th, at Three o'clock in the afternoon. Further particulars in future announcement. E. C. WOLSTENHOLME, Secretary.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE AND UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP.

We have received a letter from Miss Susan B. Anthony, from which we extract the following passages showing the nature of the issue involved in the recent decision of the American law courts against the legality of her vote. "Rochester, New York, Aug. 13, 1873.—No one event in our country has ever caused such general and respectful discussion among all classes of newspapers—and, I might add, of people—as this of my voting, and the prosecution, and trial, and verdict by United States authorities; and the discussion is still going on. The question of the United States citizen's right to vote in any state is not settled by any means by Judge Hunt's decision. It is only the beginning of the discussion of the question, and there will be no rest, no settlement, until both court and congress declare that United States citizenship carries with it the right to the franchise as well as the right of freedom into every state and territory in the union. We fought long for a national currency that should make a dollar a dollar in every state of the union—we fought long and hard for a national freedom that should make a man a man in every state—and we shall not now fail in our fight for a national citizenship that shall make a voter a voter in every state. You have doubtless heard that an Irishman may be a voter in Massachusetts, may have held office there; but if he move into Rhode Island, and live there without purchasing a freehold of a given value he cannot vote in that state; and, by Judge Hunt's decision, not only may Rhode Island thus discriminate against naturalised citizens, but any and every state may abridge or deny the right to vote for any and every cause save colour, and the United States would have no power to say nay."

SPEECH of Mr. JOHN STUART MILL on the Admission of Women to the Electoral Franchise, spoken in the House of Commons, May 20th, 1867; price 1d. Report of Meeting in Hanover Square Rooms, April 28th, 1873; price 1d. Speeches of Mr. Jacob Bright, M.P., and Professor Fawcett, M.P., in the House of Commons, April 30th, 1873; price 1d. each. "Ought Women to Learn the Alphabet?" by T. W. Higginson: Reprinted from "Atlantic Essays;" price 3d. Speech of Lady Anna Gore-Langton, at London Meeting, April 28th, 1873 (leaflet); 1s. 6d. per 100.—Published by the Central Committee, and to be obtained at their office, 9, Berners-street, London, W.

MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR  
WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

## PRIZE FUND, 1873.

Two Hundred Guineas are offered to the Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage by Two Friends, as soon as the remainder of the sum of Two Thousand Guineas shall be promised.

The committee beg to remind their friends that the financial year will close with the present month, and to make an earnest appeal to obtain the completion of the sum of two thousand guineas required for the Prize Fund. They have pleasure in reporting that £1,100 has been already received in subscriptions, and that about £250 is promised. There remains about £650 still to raise in order to obtain the prize and place the committee in a satisfactory financial position for the work of the coming season. They have prepared a plan of operations which embraces a systematic round of public meetings in various districts not hitherto worked; the arrangements are well considered, and only need the contribution of funds to enable the committee to carry them out. They desire to return hearty thanks for the support accorded them, and more especially to refer to the generous donation of £200 from "A Lover of Justice." This would merit special notice under any circumstances, but the fact that the donation is anonymous necessitates the public rendering of thanks which cannot be given personally. The gift is timely, and has a value even beyond its material one, in the proof thus afforded of sympathy with the object of the society and of approval of the manner in which the committee have endeavoured to promote it. They trust that this feeling is shared by others, and that its existence will be manifested by subscriptions for the remaining sum necessary to complete the Prize Fund.

### SUMMER LECTURES.

The committee have to report that a gratifying measure of success has attended the experiment of the lectures. Since the proposal was entertained Miss Becker has lectured in thirteen places, namely: Blackpool, Lytham, Morecambe, Windermere, Ambleside, Keswick, Matlock Bridge, Buxton, Chester, Carnarvon, Bangor, Rhyl, and Llandudno. By means of these lectures the subject has been brought under the special notice of many hundreds of persons, collected from all parts of the country. The lecture was in all cases received with eager attention, and although no formal vote or expression of assent to the views advanced was asked, the manifestations of approval were such as to make it clear that the sense of the meeting was distinctly in favour of the principle. The contributions which have been given for the special purpose of the lectures, together with the receipts, have sufficed to cover all expenses, so that the cost has not trenchoned on the general funds of the society; while the support which has been gained for the principle cannot fail to find expression, sooner or later, in the subscription list and in increased efforts in promoting the cause.

### COLLECTING CARDS.

The Committee ask those friends who may not be able to contribute largely, or who may have already given what they can, to help them by collecting small sums among their friends. Those who cannot give pounds may give shillings, and those who cannot afford shillings would often gladly give pence, if the opportunity were afforded them. Cards have been presented to many of our friends for the purpose of enabling them conveniently to collect such sums, and those who are willing to assist in this manner will have cards forwarded on application to the secretary. It is requested that all cards, with the money subscribed, may be returned on or before October 30th, that the

sums may be carried to the account of the present financial year; but should any circumstance prevent this, our friends must not suppose that the money will not be equally useful to us afterwards.

### SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS RECEIVED DURING SEPTEMBER, 1873.

	£	s.	d.
"A Lover of Justice" .....	200	0	0
Mrs. J. P. Mellor.....	100	0	0
Miss Rose Hall .....	5	5	0
Mrs. Todd (Lecture Fund).....	5	0	0
Miss E. A. Todd (Lecture Fund).....	5	0	0
Mrs. Roberts .....	2	0	0
Mrs. Stephenson Hunter .....	1	1	0
Mrs. Ryley.....	1	0	0
Lady Bowring .....	1	0	0
Mrs. Buchan (for 1872 and 1873).....	1	0	0
Mr. A. Leighton .....	0	10	0
Mrs. Donkin .....	0	8	6
Mr. G. B. ....	0	7	6
Miss Malvina Borchardt .....	0	5	0
Miss Jane Gouch .....	0	5	0
Mr. J. G. Blumer.....	0	5	0
Miss S. F. Miall .....	0	5	0
Miss M. E. Cheetham.....	0	5	0
Mrs. Plimsaul .....	0	5	0
Mrs. Dawson .....	0	2	6
Mr. Philip Dwyer .....	0	2	6
Miss M. A. Evans.....	0	2	6
Mrs. Hetherington .....	0	2	6
Mrs. Hindle.....	0	2	6
Rev. E. Kell .....	0	2	6
Miss Dunkin .....	0	2	6
Mrs. Sawyer .....	0	2	6
Mrs. Dixon .....	0	2	6
Mr. Pearce.....	0	2	6
Mr. Hardiman .....	0	2	0
Mrs. Prideaux .....	0	2	0
Mrs. Cosens .....	0	1	6
Miss Martin .....	0	1	0
Collected by Miss Rose Hall.....	0	10	0
	£326	3	6

S. ALFRED STEINTHAL, Treasurer.

107, Upper Brook-street, Manchester.

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.

### CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

Contributions to the funds of the Central Committee of the National Society for Women's Suffrage, 9, Berners Street, London, W., from August 25th to September 23rd, 1873.

	£	s.	d.
The Misses Ashworth .....	100	0	0
"A Friend," per Miss Agnes Garrett .....	100	0	0
Lady Anna Gore Langton .....	2	0	0
A. Trevelyan, Esq. ....	2	0	0
J. Croke, Esq. ....	1	1	0
Rowland Wilson, Esq. ....	0	10	0
Miss Wade .....	0	1	1
	£205	12	1

MARY DOWLING, Secretary.

### MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY COMMITTEE.

#### SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS RECEIVED SINCE MARCH, 1873.

	£	s.	d.
Miss Edith Brooke .....	20	0	0
Mrs. Cobden .....	1	1	0
Mr. T. H. Bastard .....	1	0	0
Mr. H. Nicol.....	0	10	6
Mrs. Collimore .....	0	10	0
Miss Mary Bright .....	0	5	0
	£23	6	6

LYDIA E. BECKER, Treasurer.

28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester.