

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

VOL. V.—No. 57. PUBLISHED MONTHLY.
REGISTERED FOR TRANSMISSION ABROAD.

NOVEMBER 2, 1874.

PRICE 1d.—By Post 1½d.

THE work for the season has begun vigorously and prosperously with a series of meetings in the north and eastern counties. The deputations to whom were entrusted the duty of explaining the principle on which the operations of the Society are based, and the nature of the measure proposed, found ready and attentive audiences, and cordial acceptance of their propositions. No opposition worthy of the name was anywhere offered to the subject; and though it frequently appeared that at the commencement of a meeting there was some misconception as to the scope and practical operation of the proposal, yet it was invariably found that after the ladies who advocate the cause had had the opportunity of explaining what was the nature of the demand, and how important a relation the question bore to the amelioration of the condition of women, and the amendment of the laws in the general interests of society, not only the judgment but the sympathies of the audience set strongly and decidedly in favour of the views they expounded. The resolutions affirming the principle were carried often without a single hand being held up against them, and when there were a few dissentients the opposition was of a most insignificant character, both numerically and personally.

The support given to the principle was not limited to that afforded at the meetings. In each place new members were added to the Society, and the nucleus was formed for an extension of its operations and organisation.

But in addition to working in direct connection with the Women's Suffrage Society, it is scarcely less important that all persons interested in the cause should use what influence they possess in the direction of obtaining the recognition of the political rights of women, from all politicians and organisations which aim at improving or extending the representation of the people. The question of Parliamentary reform has not reached its final stage, and the forces are converging which must shape the policy of the future. Already politicians of the Liberal party are preparing to put forth their programme, and no one would be surprised to find that Her Majesty's Government, seeing the further development of the constitutional

changes embodied in the Act of 1867 to be inevitable, were determined to keep the initiative of the subject in their own hands, and were preparing for the production of another Conservative Reform Bill. But whether further changes in our representative system be adopted as their policy by either the Government or the popular leaders, it behoves the advocates of women's suffrage to take care that their principle shall not be lost sight of, and that the claim of women to representation shall not be ignored. Wherever a meeting is gathered together to express an opinion on the further changes required in order to secure adequate representation to all classes of the community, and the resolutions proposed to such meeting do not include the removal of the disability of sex in Parliamentary elections, an amendment or rider affirming this principle ought to be submitted to the verdict of the assembly, and a vote taken upon it. Probably, in the vast majority of cases, if not universally, the vote would be in the affirmative, for it would not be consistent with the principles on which men claim political rights for themselves that they should turn round and deny these rights to others who are claiming them on the same principles, with equal earnestness and even greater need than they.

We make these remarks with special reference to an Electoral Reform Conference, which is announced to take place on the 17th instant, at the Freemasons' Tavern, in London. The first resolution to be submitted to this conference affirms that the condition of Parliamentary representation, notwithstanding the recent changes, is eminently unsatisfactory, and requires early amendment, and it enumerates among the grievances to be redressed—"That large classes of the community are still entirely unrepresented." The second resolution urges the effective co-operation of all Reformers for certain purposes, among which we are concerned especially only with the proposal for the alteration of the franchise and the relief of candidates from payment of returning officers' expenses. The proposal regarding the suffrage is limited to the equalisation of the Borough and County franchise; but if justice demands that the same qualification shall confer a vote whether it be situated in a borough or a county, justice

also demands that this qualification shall confer a vote on all persons not under legal incapacity for performing other legal acts, and not exempted from the responsibilities and burdens incident to such qualification. We urge the addition to the resolution of a clause asking for the removal of the electoral disability of sex in Parliamentary elections, and we trust that some one will be found at the conference willing to propose and able to carry such a clause.

The justice of this demand is brought into strong relief by the consideration of the proposal to support the motion of Professor FAWCETT to relieve candidates from the payment of returning officers' expenses, by placing Parliamentary elections on the same footing as elections for municipal councils and other corporate bodies. But in municipal elections the ratepayers who defray the cost are themselves the electoral body, and every one who is called upon to pay his quota of the expense is *prima facie* entitled to vote. Elections exist for the sake of the electors, and it is reasonable that these should bear the cost of them. But this is only equitable so long as the ratepayers and electors are the same persons. It is most unjust to call on any class of ratepayers to share the burdens of an election wherein they are not permitted to have a voice. In municipal elections all the ratepayers vote, and if Parliamentary elections are to be placed on the same footing as municipal elections with regard to expenses, they ought to be placed on the same footing as these elections with regard to the persons admitted to take part in them.

We may illustrate our position by reference to the case of Bridgewater. After the general election of 1868, a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into alleged cases of bribery, and on the Report of the Commission the borough was disfranchised. A rate of three shillings in the pound was levied to defray the cost of the Commission. This burden fell with crushing severity on numbers of women ratepayers, many of whom were quite unprepared to meet the demand, finding it, in their own words, "already a struggle to maintain our position in society (which some of us have to do by our own unaided exertions) with probity and respectability." They therefore addressed a memorial to Mr. GLADSTONE, praying to be relieved from "this grievance of most heavy and unjust taxation," for the payment of a prolonged Commission respecting political bribery. "We feel it to be unjust and oppressive," the memorialists set forth, "inasmuch as not exercising the franchise, nor being in any way directly or indirectly concerned in the malpractices which led to the issuing of the

"Commission, we are nevertheless required to pay not less than three shillings in the pound according to our rental." We maintain that the ladies of Bridgewater had here a reasonable ground of complaint, and that the women ratepayers in every constituency would have a similar one if, while not exercising the franchise, and being expressly excluded from concerning themselves with the election, they should nevertheless be called upon to pay a rate for defraying the cost of it.

A reply to the memorial was returned by Mr. Secretary BRUCE, who stated "That it is not in the power of the Secretary of State to exempt women, owning or occupying property, from the local and imperial taxation to which that property is liable." We admit this, but we affirm that it is in the power of the Legislature to give to women owning or occupying property, the vote which that property would carry with it along with its liability to taxation, if it were owned or occupied by men, and that political justice, and the principle recognised by the law and constitution of this realm in every other department of representative government, alike demand the measure.

THE dispute among the carpet weavers at Kidderminster has a peculiar interest for those who advocate the rights of women to a free labour market. The facts appear to be that the Messrs. BRINTON have recently employed women in working their tapestry looms, lighter and more manageable machines than the Brussels looms, and on which women are employed in other districts. The men have announced their intention to strike if the women are not taken off the looms, and as the Messrs. BRINTON, with commendable spirit, decline to discharge the women, the dispute is undecided as we write. We have received Kidderminster papers, with reports of meetings held by the men, from which we gather various items of intelligence, given in another column. The men, feeling that their case would be untenable if they insisted on the unconditional dismissal of the weavers to whose employment they object, and that "no arbitrator in Europe would order the women off the looms," endeavour to accomplish their object by requiring that the same wages shall be paid to women as to men weavers. They affirm that with equal wages no manufacturer would employ women if men were to be had; they therefore hope by this means to drive women out of the labour market. But the right to freedom for labour involves not merely the right to engage in any particular occupation, but the right to work for such remuneration as appears

satisfactory to the worker; and so long as a woman can earn more money by working at a tapestry loom than by needlework or any other branch of domestic service, we maintain that she has a perfect right to do so.

But we cannot be blind to the great danger with which the right of women to such freedom of labour as the existing law allows them is threatened. The preponderance of political power in this country is now vested in working men. The employers of labour, who are a numerical minority of electors, and the working women, who are entirely unrepresented, would be unable to resist an organised demand by working men for a law prohibiting the employment of women in such occupations as men desired to monopolise for themselves. There is as yet no Act of Parliament forbidding women to work at tapestry looms. But no session of Parliament passes away without some further legislative "restrictions on female labour," and unless working women have the protection of the suffrage it appears probable that the process of confiscation will go on till their industrial freedom is absolutely annihilated.

In a volume of essays by Professors of the Owens College, Manchester, recently published, there occurs the following passage from an address by Principal GREENWOOD, in which he urges the adoption of "a common groundwork of culture for all students." The words of the learned Principal convey so forcibly and aptly the expression of the advantages to society which would be attained by opening out the means of intellectual culture to women equally with men, that we make no apology for repeating them here. The italics are our own:—

"Grace and vigour are lent to social intercourse when men feel that they can trust to the possession by all of a certain general culture—that a common atmosphere, so to say, is shared by all; and that subtle criticisms, delicate shades of thought, apt illustrations *will not fall flat on the ears of one half of those who listen*. Those who are familiar with the social history of the first half of this century will agree with me that this element of social life was far more generally present then with cultivated men than it is now. And, again, from the want of this common elementary culture, men are without that sympathy with the pursuits of others which tends so powerfully to soften the bitterness of controversy and even to make fruitful discussion possible."

WE desire to call attention to the announcement on our first page, of the annual meeting of the Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage, to be held on the 13th instant, in the Town Hall, Manchester, and to the conversazione, which is to take place the same evening. Mr. JACOB BRIGHT will preside, and Mr. FORSYTH, M.P., and a large number of the most influential supporters of the movement will be present. It is hoped that the gathering will be, socially and politically, a distinguished success; and the attendance of as many friends as possible is earnestly invited.

PUBLIC MEETINGS.

GRIMSBY.

A meeting was held on October 5th, in the Town Hall, Grimsby. Mr. Alderman Wintringham in the chair. Miss Beedy and Miss Becker attended as a deputation, and the resolutions, which were carried enthusiastically, were moved and seconded by the Rev. J. Fordyce, Mr. Councillor Keetly, Mr. T. Stephenson, and Mr. Councillor Smehurst, senr. Mr. Alderman Bannister made a speech in opposition, which was replied to by Miss Becker, who had the feeling of the meeting with her, and the resolutions were carried enthusiastically. Votes of thanks concluded the proceedings.

Mr. Chapman has addressed the following letter acknowledging the receipt of the memorial:—

Hill End, 8th October, 1874.

Dear sir,—I am obliged to you for sending the memorial of the inhabitants of Grimsby (received this morning), on the electoral disabilities of women. I am in favour of the measure, and trust when I have an opportunity of seeing the Bill that I shall be able to support it.—I am, yours truly, (Signed)

JOHN CHAPMAN, Esq., Grimsby.

Sir J. D. Astley returned the following reply:—

Heath Cottage, Newmarket, October 10th, 1874.

Dear sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of memorial in support of the removal of the electoral disabilities of women, but I must honestly say I do not concur in the views you advocate, as I am of opinion that the softer sex have plenty to do in their own households; and have a particular objection to women who give much time and attention to politics; if such ladies exist in your neighbourhood, why not let them by their sweet influence move the feelings of their male friends to give utterance and force to their ideas? but better far let them attend to the bringing up of the young, and the comfort of the male population.—Yours truly,

J. D. ASTLEY.

HULL.

A public meeting was held on October 6th, in the Royal Institution, Hull. Mr. Councillor Elam in the chair. Miss Beedy, Miss Tod, and Miss Becker attended as a deputation, and the resolutions were supported by Mr. Alderman Dowsing, the Rev. J. M. Dixon, Mr. Stuart, and Mr. G. K. King, and carried by a large majority.

THIRSK.

On October 7th, a meeting was held in the Mechanics' Institute, Thirsk. Mr. Bartholomew Smith in the chair. Miss Beedy, Miss Tod, and Miss Becker, formed the deputation, and petitions to Parliament, and memorials to the members for the borough and the North Riding of Yorkshire, were supported by Mr. G. R. Baker, Mr. R. Ashman, Mr. J. W. Hall, Mr. Jacques, and others, and carried.

NORTHALLERTON.

A crowded and enthusiastic meeting was held in the Town Hall, Northallerton, on October 8th. The Rev. R. Crookall, Independent minister, in the chair. Miss Beedy, Miss Tod, and Miss Becker, attended as a deputation, and resolutions adopting petitions and memorials to the members for the borough and county, were moved and supported by the Rev. J. Anderson, Wesleyan minister, Mr. Guthrie, Mr. Middleton, and other local gentlemen, and carried unanimously.

MIDDLESBROUGH.

On October 13th, a public meeting was held in the Oddfellows' Hall, Middlesbrough. The Mayor (E. Williams, Esq.) occupied the chair, and along with him on the platform were the Rev. J. Fletcher, Wesleyan minister, the Rev. H. Hall (Unitarian), and Messrs. Jeremiah Head, James Jennings, William Taylor, W. Wilkinson, and J. Dunning. Miss Beedy and Miss Becker formed the deputation, and the resolutions were moved and supported by them after being seconded by the above named gentlemen. They were carried unanimously, and the proceedings concluded with the usual votes of thanks.

RIPON.

A densely crowded meeting was held on October 14th, in the Public Room, Ripon. The Mayor occupied the chair. The usual resolutions were moved and seconded by local gentlemen, supported by Miss Beedy and Miss Becker, and carried unanimously. The proceedings concluded with a vote of thanks to the deputation and the chairman.

WEST HARTLEPOOL.

A crowded meeting was held in the large hall of the Athenæum, West Hartlepool, on Oct. 15th, when Miss Becker and Miss Beedy attended as a deputation. Mr. Cuthbert Emmerson, chairman of the Town Improvement Commissioners, presided, and amongst those on the platform were Mr. and Mrs. E. Lewis, Mr. Commissioner Furness, Mr. Commissioner Capstaff, Mr. W. R. Owen, Mr. Thos. Hope, Mr. Smith, Mr. T. Noddings, Mr. McKay, Mr. Cochrane, Mr. Atkinson, and the Rev. W. Hetherington, Baptist preacher. After some remarks by the chairman, the first resolution was moved by Mr. Noddings and seconded by Mrs. Lewis, of West Hartlepool, in a feeling and eloquent speech, which was received with prolonged applause. Miss Beedy supported the resolution, which was carried unanimously. The second resolution was moved by Mr. W. R. Owen, seconded by Mr. Turner, supported by Miss Becker, was also carried unanimously. Votes of thanks concluded the proceedings.

DARLINGTON.

A public meeting was held on October 16th, in the Central Hall, Darlington. Arthur Pease, Esq., Mayor of Darlington, in the chair. The attendance was very good. Miss Beedy and Miss Becker appeared as a deputation, and the resolutions were moved and seconded by the Rev. W. A. P. Johnman, Mr. W. C. Parker, Mr. J. T. Shewell, and Mr. Cudworth, and carried unanimously. The usual votes of thanks concluded the proceedings.

NORWICH.

A large public meeting was held on October 5th, in the Victoria Hall, Norwich; Mr. George White occupied the chair. Miss Helena P. Downing and Miss Florence Fenwick Miller attended as a deputation from the society and supported the resolutions, which were moved and seconded by Mr. Councillor Dakin, Mr. Bunting, Mr. R. A. Cooper, and adopted. Votes of thanks concluded the proceedings.

YARMOUTH.

A similar meeting was held on October 8th, in the Town Hall, Yarmouth, the hall being crowded with an interested audience. The Mayor occupied the chair, and was supported on the platform by Mr. Councillor J. F. Neave, Mr. Councillor J. Woodger, and Mr. Dowsett, jun. Mr. Deputy-Mayor C. Woolverton and Mr. T. Todd were also present. The first resolution was moved by Mr. Dowsett. This was followed by an address from Miss Downing. Mr. Woodger moved the second resolution, which was seconded by Miss Miller in an able and eloquent speech, which was listened to with great attention and frequently applauded. Votes of thanks to the Mayor for presiding, and to the ladies for their addresses closed the meeting.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE *versus* Mr. GOLDWIN SMITH.

(Continued from page 137.)

Mr. Smith asserts that "the love of liberty and the desire of being governed by law appear to be characteristically male." And this in the "age of Bismarck!" of "blood and iron." Are we then to believe that it was a *plébiscite* of women who maintained imperialism in France? Are the armaments of Europe to be accepted as the expression of this "characteristically male" desire for free institutions? Mr. Smith states that the condition of elective government, with the liberty of opinion and the power of progress which are its concomitants, is still exceedingly precarious. "All the powers of class interest, of sybaritism, of superstition, are arrayed against it, and have vast forces at their command, including the *great standing armies of Europe*." Now, if there is one institution more than another which is "characteristically male," it is surely a great standing army; yet Mr. Smith reckons such armies among the vast forces which threaten the existence of elective government.

Mr. Smith appears to affirm that women's political tendencies as distinguished from those of men are characterised by a preference for personal government. We may leave it to the consciousness of every woman to contradict the implied assertion that women have no love of liberty, and do not desire to be governed by law. Where free institutions exist, these aspirations are common to the higher natures in both sexes. But the vast majority of the population of the globe are under personal government; and if we are to believe Mr. Smith's assertion as to what is "characteristically male," we may be asked to accept the proposition that the despotic power of European and Asiatic potentates is maintained through the preference of women for personal government, and the preponderance of this influence over the "characteristically male" desire for free institutions. We maintain, in opposition to Mr. Smith, that the love of liberty and the desire of being governed by law is characteristic of race, and not of sex, and that the women of free countries share the love of men for free government, although they have been as yet denied participation in its privileges.

Mr. Smith says there are women eminently capable of understanding and discussing political questions, and he says these may find a sphere in the press through which many men exercise a power which makes it a matter of indifference whether they have a vote or not. But he overlooks the essential difference between the possession of the right or legal capacity to exercise a vote and the mere possession of the vote. Every man is a potential voter, and it is a matter of indifference, so far as his influence as a writer or thinker is concerned, whether he is an actual voter or not. His opinions are those of one presumed to be capable of forming an intelligent opinion on public affairs. But women are excluded from the right to become voters on the express ground that they are presumed to be incapable of forming an intelligent opinion on political subjects, and therefore the opinions they express are not and cannot be received with the same consideration as is given to the opinions of men.

Mr. Smith assumes that if women were admitted to vote they must be made eligible for seats in the House of Commons. But there is no necessary connection between these things. Clergymen are allowed to vote, but not to sit in the House of Commons. At one time there was a property qualification for members of Parliament. This has been now abolished, but we are not aware that any one ever used as an argument against it the proposition that because persons without landed property might vote in the election of members such men ought to be eligible for seats in Parliament. The property qualification still

exists for town councillors, so that the vast majority of burgesses in municipal districts are legally excluded from seats in the council for which they vote; and when the Legislature removed the disability which prevented the exercise of the municipal franchise by women ratepayers, the relaxation was limited to the right to vote, and women are not allowed to be nominated for election as councillors. The fact that the question was never raised when the municipal franchise was given proves that the Legislature regards the right to vote as wholly distinct from the capacity to be elected.

Mr. Smith says "under the elective system, women would have to make their way to seats in Parliament and to office by the same means as male politicians, by canvassing, stumping, wrestling with competitors in debate, and the female character would be exposed to influences entirely different from those which operated on Isabella of Castille." But it is too late to raise this objection. The process which he deprecates is an accomplished fact. The elective system has been extended to women, and they have had to make their way, if not to seats in Parliament, to seats at school boards by those very avenues of "canvassing, stumping, and wrestling with competitors in debate," the description of which appears to have scared Mr. Smith's imagination from its propriety. But how about the reality? The contest for a seat at a school board in a large constituency does not differ in kind or process from that for a seat in Parliament. Exactly the same machinery is employed, the candidates issue addresses, they appear at public meetings to explain their opinions and answer questions, and the matters on which the elections turn involve some of the most hotly disputed subjects in the realm of politics. Yet ladies have taken up this duty, to which they were distinctly called by the action of the Legislature in making them eligible for election. They have sought and won the suffrages of some of the largest constituencies in the kingdom, using the same methods as those employed by their masculine compeers, and they have done this quietly, simply, and unostentatiously, without thereby forfeiting one particle of their personal dignity, or losing one fraction of the respect and consideration accorded to their sex and their position as ladies. When elected, they have taken their full share of the legislative and administrative work of the boards, work which has involved the liability to be called upon to maintain their views or support their proposals by the process sensationally described by Mr. Smith as "wrestling with competitors in debate." After this it is surely too late to object to the "extension of the elective system to women," so far as to admit them to the privilege of giving a vote in the election of members of Parliament by the same process as that which they employ in other elections.

One of the most specious of the objections urged against the extension of the franchise to women is based on the assumption that government rests on physical force. The form in which Mr. Smith puts the objection appears to involve the proposition that if women were allowed a voice in legislation, law would be set at defiance and government be overturned, through the public consciousness that the law was partly enacted by the consent of persons who were not supposed to possess physical force to impose it on the community. But this objection, if valid, is fatal to most, if not all, forms of organised government, and more especially to monarchical government. The physical force on which law makers depend in the last resort is not, and never has been, in this country at least, embodied in the persons who make the laws or elect the law-givers. The army and police are mechanically organised forces, directed and controlled by a supreme or sovereign power, whose authority over them is not derived from physical force. The army does not submit to the Queen, or to the commander-in-

chief, from a consciousness that either possesses "executive force, the rude but indispensable basis of law." Mr. Smith says civilisation cannot eliminate force. True, but it can bring force under the dominion of law.

The executive force is not the supreme power in any state. The power which controls and directs the executive force may be vested in a single hereditary monarch, in a president or sovereign, elected by popular suffrage, or in a legislative assembly. But in no case is the power in the hands of any person or body of persons able to impose their decrees by physical force, if disobeyed by the executive or organised force. By our own constitution the assent of a woman sovereign is necessary to confer the force of law on an Act of Parliament, yet we do not find that law is set at defiance because of the public consciousness that the sovereign has not physical force to sanction the legal Act. Neither is the law less respected from the consciousness of the insignificant amount of physical force embodied in the persons whose deliberations have shaped and determined its form. The legislative force of this country is vested in about eleven hundred men of the two Houses of Parliament, and one woman. The decrees of these persons, given according to constitutional forms, are supreme over the destinies of about thirty millions of persons. Of the eleven hundred men, about five hundred form the House of Lords, a body whose power does not rest on an appeal to physical power in any shape, and which has no pretension to the character of representing the opinions or wishes of a numerical majority of men; yet, although complaints occasionally arise of the manner in which the peers exercise their legislative functions, it will hardly be affirmed that the consent of the House of Lords actually weakens the force of law, from "the bad effects of the public consciousness . . . that the law was being made by those who had not the power to carry it into effect." Yet this consequence ought to ensue if Mr. Smith's dictum be sound.

THE CARPET WEAVERS AND THE RIGHTS OF WOMEN.

We have received Kidderminster papers, from which we gather the following intelligence:—At a meeting held on October 20th, an observation from a weaver that "we don't want the women" was loudly cheered.—Mr. John Lane said: "Don't let it be said that they countenanced women working on looms when they had money to protect their own interests." "There was no reason for women being employed while men were walking the streets." "There was the Lancashire cotton famine, when the operatives said that they would die rather than recognise the slave; and let this be the motto of every one present—let them die rather than recognise the women."—Mr. Cooke said, "they should protest against women working at men's work." At a conference between Messrs. Brinton and their Brussels weavers, the former stated that they preferred that their tapestry looms should be worked by women, but they had not the slightest intention of putting women out to the Brussels looms. The firm claimed as a right to employ such persons as they thought proper on such work as was fitting for their capacity and strength. That was freedom of labour. The law of England recognised it, and would not allow it to be interfered with, for the right of every man, woman, and child were bound up with freedom of labour, as with the very air they breathed. A weaver said he should like Mr. Brinton to take the girls off at once. He (the speaker) should not like to have been the first manufacturer to put girls on the looms.—A weaver said before girls and women were put on a level with men, and to do their work, he thought the legislature should make them equal with men; but they had not responsibilities

which men had. He knew, too, that girls were weaving at good wages, while their elder brothers could only earn 10s. a week.—Another weaver: You ought to sympathise with men.—Mr. Brinton: So we do, and we ought to sympathise with women as well.—The weaver (continuing) asked if it would not be a more humane thing for the firm, as there were so many men walking about, to take off the women, as there was plenty of employment for females in the neighbourhood. There was the humane side of the question to be looked at, and he considered the firm were not taking the humane side of the question at all. It would be more humane if they took the females off.—A weaver observed that he could now find plenty of young men from 18 to 25, who would be glad to be employed at the looms, and to get more wages than they were at present doing. But they were pegged back, and girls were getting on looms in their place. He had a son of 19, and it was hard to see a girl stepping before him. He had grown-up daughters at work, but he should not like them to step in anywhere where they would throw men out. He should shake his head at them very severely.—A weaver: The meeting resolved last Thursday to arbitrate if you would take the women off.—Mr. Brinton: We shall not take the women off; it is begging the question.—A threatening letter has been sent to the father of two young women, and the writer says they may think they are "doing something grand" by robbing men of their daily bread, but they are to be careful what they are doing, or they will very likely get their brains knocked out. A long address was issued in Kidderminster arguing for the justice of the men's cause, and putting in "a word to our fair rivals, the lady weavers." Women are sometimes called the "soft sex," and the men must believe with Mr. Weller that their "fair rivals" belong to a very soft sex indeed if they attempt to coax them out of their daily bread by such fine phrases. That they do not all justify the estimate formed of their capacity may be gathered from the following spirited letter, which has been addressed to the editor of the *Kidderminster Shuttle*:—

"Dear Mr. Editor,—I don't know whether you are an advocate for women's rights, but from the perusal of your valuable paper I know you like fair play; and that is just what the women of Kidderminster want, and nothing more. I have a right to sell my labour at any price I like, and when and where I like: and the liberty I claim for myself I will gladly give to others. Then why should those *very big men* have their crowded meetings and throw off such big words from such little stomachs? Why should they meet and revile their betters? Mr. Brinton is a gentleman, he knows how to behave in the presence of a lady, and he studies the comfort and convenience of the 'lady weavers' employed in manufactories. Those lords of creation, or *rather tyrants* cannot understand how it is that 'lady weavers' should be employed at tapestry work unless it is on grounds of economy. Let one of the 'ladies' enlighten them. Mr. Brinton is a man of business and education, and must therefore be well aware that the fair sex greatly excel in all the lighter branches of industry. That, in my opinion, is a sufficient answer to the power-loom weavers. It is quite evident that the power-loom weavers have no concern for any but self, or they would not block up the streets and market place, puffing their dirty short pipes, whilst women and young girls have to do the hardest and heaviest work in the trade; such as rug weaving, which requires both bone and muscle to perform it. It is disgraceful to those who call themselves men, to whine and cry about female competition, and to seek the sympathy and protection of the public at large. What sympathy and protection have they given to outside traders? Look at their union and Co-operative Stores! What consideration have they had for the tailor, shoemaker, grocer,

or draper? They quite ignore the scriptural injunction, 'That whatsoever measure ye shall mete unto others it shall be measured to you again.' If they think it impossible to compete with the fair sex, let them set up a co-operative carpet manufactory, and employ their 'small hoardings' in legitimate trading. And where would they be in a twelve-month if only the male sex were employed? Experience would perhaps teach them that 'their occupation's gone.' But they need not despair; let them qualify themselves for honest industry, and, if needs be, get from under the distasteful skylights; there must be an opening for them whilst beef and mutton is so near a shilling per lb. With your kind permission, Mr. Editor, just before I close this epistle, I will just refer to two of the speeches delivered at the great meeting of weavers, reported in your last edition. I am so sorry I received no invitation to be present on that eventful evening. If I could but have heard that silken speech delivered by Mr. Silk, I would have used my best energy to have got him modelled in wax, with his exact attitude and expression, just when he quoted Shakspeare. I might then, perhaps, have got him immortalised by having him placed in a suitable chamber at Madame Tassaud's London Exhibition. The other was delivered by Mr. Cooke. I don't know him personally, but I am somewhat familiar with his pretty verses I have so often read in the *Shuttle*. I don't know his wife either, as she works at another factory. She does not work at ours, or I should offer her some valuable advice, for I fear he sometimes gets the drink, and mixes in unsuitable company, or else he would not jeer us as he did in his speech. He appears to think ours is a questionable taste to 'adorn beauty' with feathers; perhaps it is, but feathers, like carpets, are harmless luxuries, and we should encourage trade. I think that to spend a crown on a harmless luxury like a feather, is much better than spending one in a single evening in that debasing luxury drink, which he admitted to have done himself when he sent you the verses about his wife—'Carrie's gone to Clent.' I will forgive him for jeering us in his speech, because I think Carrie must have again gone to Clent; but I do hope when next she goes she will take him with her, and that they each may enjoy the 'Robin's Song.' Dear Mr. Editor, I shall thank you to publish this in your next paper without my name and address (which I enclose), or I may be alarmed some morning when I go to breakfast by receiving a 'threatening letter,' and allow me to subscribe myself.

"A LADY WEAVER."

PATERNAL LEGISLATION FOR WOMEN.

The recent paternal legislation for women employed in mines and factories has had the effect that its opponents predicted. The Mines Regulation Act of 1872 stipulates that all women and girls employed in mining work shall have an hour and a half for meals when they work over eight hours. In the whole of South Wales the men work nine hours, and take half-an-hour out of that for dinner. Formerly girls used to find employment in riddling on the pit banks, or other light work, but under the new regulations it would be necessary to stop work for them during an interval of an hour longer than the men have been accustomed to take. The consequence is that the girls are replaced by men or boys, and have to seek employment with the farmers and publicans in the neighbourhood, where they have to work from morning till night for less wages. It might be good for the men that they should take a longer rest in the middle of their work, but they or their employers do not see it, and the result of this benevolent attempt to protect women has been to drive them into situations where they have more work and less play.—*Examiner*.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION.

To the Editor of the *Women's Suffrage Journal*.

Madam,—The Women's Suffrage Bill having been laid aside last session, I have been obliged to renew my protest of previous years against "taxation without representation," by allowing my things to be distrained for Queen's taxes. Yesterday they were offered by auction at Hendon. A considerable number of persons were present at the sale, and I understand that the general feeling appeared to be in favour of women's suffrage. I hope that next year the force of public opinion, and the justice of Parliament, will carry the measure and relieve me from a disagreeable duty, which I feel incumbent on me so long as the right of representation is denied to women-householders. Are not we who protest in this way entitled to sympathy, as much as the people at Exeter, who refuse the "Dominicals"? They are looked upon as the champions of religious liberty and equality; and we are contending for the liberty and equality—religious, social, and political—of half the community.—I am, yours respectfully,

ROSE A. HALL.

Hendon, Oct. 1st.

ARE WOMEN READY TO BEAR ARMS?

To the Editor of the *Women's Suffrage Journal*.

Madam,—You may, perhaps, consider it superfluous that I should add any remarks to those already made in answer to the article—"Are Women ready to bear Arms," in the number of the *Women's Suffrage Journal* for the current month; but I am induced to solicit your attention to my uncalled-for contribution from the real desire to be informed on the subject.

It seems to me that the ladies who have taken up the defence against the writer of that article have not laid sufficient stress upon the groundlessness of the assertion (if it be groundless), that military capacity is an indispensable requisite for enjoying civil rights and privileges; yet this, if it be a point at all, must be the turning point of the whole matter.

Now, I have to ask—apart from the fact that so many men are from various causes incapacitated from bearing arms—since when has this been regarded as an avowedly necessary condition of full citizenship? Even amongst the Prussians, emphatically a nation of soldiers, that is, who are required, all in turn, at some period of their lives, to play the part of soldiers, are the comparatively few "Unfähige" disqualified through their "Unfähigkeit," *per se*, for being treated as citizens?

Is the possession of mere physical strength to be made the pivot on which social claims are to turn? If so, it seems to me that the spirit of Christianity is but a name, and brute force practically rules our so-called Christian world.

If women were to demand to bear arms, or to undertake any occupation which is obviously inconsistent with their physical nature, it might indeed be urged against them that they were unreasonably "self-asserting," and their puny expostulations on the matter be regarded as unworthy even of the notice of contempt and ridicule; but all that they do demand for themselves is the recognition of their right to do whatever (it being lawful in itself) God has given them the power to do, and He certainly has given them the power to be interested in the welfare of their country, and in the choice of its rulers, upon whom that welfare depends.

The article in question abounds in weak points, indeed one would conclude that it was, generally, written by some one who has allowed his irritation to get the better of his reason; and were the same amount of prejudice and temper exhibited

in any other connection, men, at least, would, I suspect, be tempted to say it must have been written by a woman.

However, I do not at all concern myself about the unreasonableness of the details, since it is the central principle that appears to me to be at fault, namely, that human beings who are physically incapable of bearing arms, should for that reason be denied "the full privileges of citizenship." The most substantial objections that I have as yet met with, to the enfranchisement of women, are the old-fashioned ones—to which I have not been given a satisfactory answer—that dissensions may be produced in homes where the husband and wife differ in politics, and that women may be misled to neglect positive domestic duties for the sake of an imagined patriotism or philanthropy; and certain it is that they must read political papers, must think on the subject, must, in short, devote time to it, in order to give a conscientious vote. But the answer with which I have hitherto had to content my own mind is, that whilst these objections apply especially to married women, it lies in the power of any authorised voter *not* to vote, so that those who are prevented by circumstances from giving due attention to the matter may leave it alone, and conscience soon acquaints us with the duties that claim our first, and, perhaps, sole attention.

For myself, the question does not touch me personally; I am quite beyond the range of all property qualification; but as a point of justice concerning those whom it does closely affect, I feel greatly interested; and the counter-query that always arises in my mind to that of "Why should women desire the franchise?" is, "Why should those who do desire it not have it?" What I have said may betray ignorance as to facts, and it is because I am aware of this that I have tried to avoid all appearance even of a disputatious spirit; and since my own quiet sphere is far removed from the vortex of politics, the opinions I form may perhaps be regarded as fairly dispassionate.

You will do me a great favour if you will kindly set me right where I am wrong, and in the hope that I shall not already have occupied too much of your time and attention.—Believe me, dear madam, yours faithfully,

Sep. 11th, 1874.

E. F. E.

A WIFE IN DIFFICULTIES.

To the Editor of the *Women's Suffrage Journal*.

Madam,—Your efforts in behalf of the ill-used of your own sex must be my excuse for troubling you on a point which you, I think, well understand. I mean the law as it affects a married woman's dependence on her husband, and his on her.

The landlady of the house in which I am staying has a worthless husband who long since gave up attempting to keep her, though earning money at times which he spends in drinking and other vices. A friend has advanced her the money to take a furnished lodginghouse, and she pays over to him monthly a sum agreed upon. About a month ago the husband took £26, money due to him for contract work, and during the execution of which the wife had kept and supplied him with pocket money, and went away until he had spent it all. He then came back and said he would live at home and do nothing. At last he struck and ill-used her so seriously that she told the friend who had assisted her in getting this house (a lawyer in the place), and he obtained a warrant, and the husband was taken into custody. This occurred last Saturday week. On the following Monday he was bound over to keep the peace in a bond from his father for £100. He then was allowed to come and take his clothes away, a bed and bedding which the poor woman had bought with her own savings, and many small things, but he was told if he took linen or such things as she required for her

business, he would take away her means of earning her living, and must keep her. He left them and went away, but came back again on Saturday night, almost frightening the poor woman out of her senses, but not actually striking her. Ought he to be allowed to come back to the house, and must she keep him either during the six months or after, and is there any way to prevent him coming?—Sincerely yours,
M. E. T.

VIGILANCE ASSOCIATION FOR THE DEFENCE OF PERSONAL RIGHTS.

The fourth annual meeting of the members and supporters of the Vigilance Association for the Defence of Personal Rights, and for the Amendment of the Law in Points wherein it is Injurious to Women, was held October 15th, in the Hamilton Rooms, Park Street, Bristol, when there was a good attendance. Mr. T. Pease presided, and among those on the platform were the Rev. Russell Carpenter (Bridport), Professor Sheldon Amos, M.A. (Professor of Jurisprudence, University College, London), Mr. H. J. Wilson, Mr. H. Thomas, Mrs. Josephine E. Butler (Liverpool), Miss Tod (Belfast), Miss Wilson, Miss Mary Carpenter, &c.

The CHAIRMAN, in opening the proceedings, referred at some length to the Mutiny Acts and the unfair methods of legislation by which these enactments were passed. This was only one of those instances in which there had been laws passed which so deeply affected the most rightful and personal liberties of so many of the Queen's subjects, the nation knowing very little of what was going on. Another subject was the restriction of the freedom of labour, which affected unjustly the position of women. He thought the recent Factory Act affecting the labour of women was a very great mistake and very unjust. The attempts to alter the laws for the protection of young girls and the punishment of their deceivers would be referred to. The measure for mitigating and removing of this cruel evil would be again brought before Parliament, with more prospect of success. This society was one which had had the courage to meet this question and to defy all misunderstanding and obloquy by which it might be assailed or subjected. It had investigated the real cause of these restrictions on women.

Miss WILSON read the annual report, of which the following is an abstract:—

Your committee, in presenting their fourth annual report, desire most anxiously to call the attention of all their friends to the fact, that in spite of their most earnest efforts during a period of two years and a half, in spite of the strong popular feeling aroused two years ago on the subject, in spite of the solemn pledges of one administration, and the implied support in 1873 of certain persons now influential members of the existing administration, the shameful immunities formerly expressly conferred upon soldiers and marines by the 40th section of the Mutiny Act, and the 54th of the Marine Mutiny Act, are still, although nominally withdrawn, practically in as full force as ever.

One hundred and ninety-five petitions in favour of the Offences against the Person Bill, with 13,040 signatures, were presented, and everything promised that at a very early date the measure would become law; when the order for committee of the House was discharged, and the Bill referred to a select committee.

The British Parliament has, during the last session, decreed by an overwhelming majority the enactment of further restrictions on freedom of labour amongst women; and the highest authority in the land has told us that this is only an indication of the policy which the Government means to pursue.

The work of the last session, from some points of view, wears an encouraging aspect; at one time it almost seemed as if a reign of terror had set in for women, whose dearest and most sacred rights were to be at once and in so many ways violated. But the progress of events has shown that even where positive reform cannot be attempted with success, positive mischievous retrogression may be prevented with comparative ease. Yet retrogression will come sooner or later, without positive advance, and unless we are perpetually perfecting our ideal of justice, that ideal may easily become false and feeble. Your committee ask your aid in seeking to embody the highest present conceptions of justice in fair and equal law, and to carry that ideal still higher by the creation of a purified social opinion.

They thank their friends heartily for the liberal support of a financial kind, which has this year been given to their efforts. For the first months of the year their prospects were gloomy, owing to the utter inadequacy of their resources to the greatness of their task. But thanks to the kindness of many friends, the association has been relieved from all its financial difficulties, and should the guarantee fund be completed, the work of the new year may, it is to be hoped, and by the aid of these larger resources, become more vigorous than ever.

The treasurer's account showed that the receipts amounted to £1,420. 3s. 4d., and, after payment of current accounts, there remained a balance in hand of £60. 3s. 6d.

Mrs. JOSEPHINE E. BUTLER next addressed the meeting. She gave an elaborate description of the objects of the association, and said the society endeavoured to avoid what might be termed doubtful rights, and to advance such rights as were embraced in the definition of the Magna Charta. They might also embrace the rights of children, their rights at the hands of their parents and the State. It was a mistake to suppose it was the work of defending personal rights against personal infringement, or of redressing personal wrongs. The peculiarity of the association was that it had acted against certain laws of an oppressive or aggressive character, and the aggressions of Government acting without the sanction of the people. Not the least valuable part of the association's work were the constant reminders to legislators of the freedom of the people. She referred at great length to the restrictions placed on the labour of women, and pointed out how these restrictions tended to force women to an immoral life. She said a Parliament of rich men was unfit to legislate for the poor on such questions as those. It was important in this national danger that they should oppose all legislation which restricted the freedom of women in industrial pursuits. In conclusion, she proposed the adoption of the report and statement of accounts.

The CHAIRMAN then read a letter from Mr. M. Whitwill, enclosing a subscription of £1.

Mr. H. WILSON, of Sheffield, seconded the motion, and in doing so he said he wished to protest once and for all in the city of Bristol against the doctrine which was abroad in reference to women's actions, namely, that if they did not speak out it showed they did not care about it; and if they did speak out, they were told they were matters with which they were not concerned, and that they had nothing to do with it. Another point was, that if people would give a little earnest consideration to such questions as those which the association took up and brought into prominent notice, they would feel that they were deserving of a great deal more consideration than they received throughout the country, for although they might not all agree with everything the association brought forward, yet he thought it was of the very greatest importance to have such matters thoroughly investigated, carefully analysed, and the opposite fully explained.

The Rev. RUSSELL CARPENTER (Bridport), supported the resolution, which was then put and carried.

The Rev. R. A. TAYLOR moved the appointment of a committee, whose names he read. The Rev. E. HARRIS seconded the resolution.

Miss TOD, of Belfast, supported the motion. She said the duty of preserving the liberty their ancestors established and handed down to them, was no less imperative than that of keeping the commandments. She gave a succinct account of the origin and progress of the Factory Acts, and said they must try to break down those trammels which had been thrust upon their sex by unjust, inconsiderate, and ignorant laws. They would have to fight yet this restrictive legislation, not once, not twice, but many times.

On the motion of Professor SHELDON AMOS, seconded by Mr. ALAN GREENWELL, thanks were given to the chairman, and the meeting separated.—Abridged from the Bristol Times.

PROFESSOR FAWCETT, M.P., ON EDUCATION FOR WOMEN.

On October 20th, Professor Fawcett, M.P., addressed a very large meeting at the Hackney Town Hall, on the question of education, in advocating the cause of the Girls' Public Day School Company, in connexion with the National Union for Improving the Education of Women, under the Presidency of Princess Louise. Sir Charles Reed presided, and there were present, besides Mr. Picton, one of the members for the district on the London School Board, Mrs. William Grey, and many of the clergymen of the district. A resolution in support of the purpose of the meeting was moved by the Rev. L. Shelford, seconded by Mr. J. A. Crossman, a former member of the London School Board for the district. Professor Fawcett, on rising to support the resolution, was received with warm cheering. After referring to the scheme before the meeting, he said, although on certain educational questions we may not be all entirely agreed, yet there can be no one in this room who will fail to recognise the importance of the higher education of women. Unfortunately, the cause of their higher education has been sometimes injured and prejudiced by those who advocate it being drawn away into a purposeless discussion about the intellectual equality of the two sexes. If I am asked whether I think women possess equal intellectual powers with men, my reply would be, that we have not enough experience to decide the question. Upon it I will only make these few remarks—that when we consider how few have been the intellectual opportunities of women, that they have neither had public schools nor universities, that they have had none of the stimulus to intellectual activity given by vast educational endowments, we should feel surprise, not that women have not done more, but that they have been able to do half as much as they have done. But, even suppose it could be proved that on an average the intellect of a woman is not equal to that of a man, that would not afford the smallest justification for neglecting to make the very utmost of the faculties with which women have been endowed. I should be the last to advocate that all girls should be educated in exactly the same way as boys. This would seem to me to be just as foolish and unreasonable as to make every boy pass through the same curriculum of instruction. This is the great mistake which has in the past been committed in our public schools, for it used to be the custom, far more than it is now, to try to force into the head of every boy so much Latin and Greek, even if he had not the slightest capacity for acquiring language, and to make him spend so many hours a week in doing Latin and Greek verses, although it might be about as hopeful to try to extract any semblance of a poetical idea from him as it would be to try to draw water from a rock. There is another misconception with regard to education upon which I should like to say a few words, and which has a special bearing upon a proposal to provide better instruction for women. It may be frequently observed that many, and among them some who occupy a most influential position in the country, take what is termed a practical view of education, and estimate the value of knowledge by the practical use to which it can be turned in after-life. Some time since one of our leading statesmen attempted to make the audience whom he was addressing believe there could be little use in teaching mathematics, because very few people in after-life could apply their mathematics to any practical purpose. It is no doubt true that perhaps not one out of a thousand has to make an astronomical calculation, and the lawyer, the politician, or the man of business can no doubt rarely use the differential or integral calculus to solve some legal, political, or mercantile problem. This no doubt is true, but it is impossible to over-estimate the advantage

which may be conferred by mathematics, if, in the process of acquiring them, the mind has to be so trained as to improve the general powers of reasoning. The speaker then gave his own experience of mathematics, stating that when he was a student at Cambridge he devoted the whole of his time to the study, but circumstances had occurred which had led him since to devote his time chiefly to the study of political economy and theoretical and practical politics, without devoting a single hour, since he had taken his degree, to the teaching of mathematics, or to the solution of mathematical problems; and, looking back upon the past by the light of his present experience, he could only say that if he were going to live his life over again he would certainly not devote one single hour less than he had done to this study. He went on to say,—It is taking this purely practical or mercantile view of knowledge which has done so much to hinder the higher education of girls. I have heard it sometimes said,—“It is all very well to teach a girl classics, mathematics, and science if she is going to get her own living as a teacher; she will command a higher salary, and the money will be well expended. But if she is married what will be the use of all this? She will not then require to translate ‘Thucydides’ or ‘Horace,’ or to be studying science; what she will then require will be to make a comfortable home for her husband, and to watch carefully and tenderly over her children.” It is no doubt impossible to set too high a value upon women becoming, in the best sense of the word, good wives and mothers, yet I venture to assert with no little confidence that the more carefully a woman's mind is trained the more likely is she not only to become a suitable companion for her husband, but to manage her house with skill and to obtain the best and most enduring influence over her children. (Loud cheers.) In conclusion, the speaker urged that endowments for scholarships for these schools ought to be looked for at the hands of the City Companies, and he suggested that there should be an inquiry into the funds of these companies as there had been into the affairs of the Universities and Colleges. If this were done, he said, some of those endowments left to us by the munificence of a past age would be the means of bringing culture and higher education within the reach of the humblest. The Professor resumed his seat amid loud and enthusiastic cheering. The resolutions submitted in support of the schools were carried.

THE RIGHTS OF MOTHERS IN ITALY.

In Italy, by a law passed in 1866, the mother, on the death of the father, becomes sole guardian of their children. No other person can be the legal guardian, even though the father appoint one according to the desire, and with the sanction of the mother. On the children attaining their majority, she need give no account of her administration of the property, consequently she can do what she pleases with it; spend to the full income, or let some accumulate to her private benefit. In fact she succeeds to the *paterna potestà*, or to the same authority as that held by the father. Should a widow marry again, the law makes provision for the summons of a family council, which, with specified legal assistance, decides whether the custody of the children and their property shall or shall not be left in her hands. All children of fourteen have a voice in the matter. It has not been found that either the children or their property suffer from being in the mother's charge; though there are some women to be found who wish themselves quit of the trouble and responsibility guardianship entails, and who would like the re-establishment of the old order of things.

GEORGE GROTE ON GRADUAL ENFRANCHISEMENT.

In an essay on the Essentials of Parliamentary Reform, published among the collection of Grote's minor works referring to a proposal for extending the franchise among the masses of the people, by gradually lowering the qualification at the end of certain fixed periods, so as, after a while, to render the franchise nearly co-extensive with the community. In the original the passage refers to the poor, or the masses of uneducated men. We have substituted the words in brackets for words conveying this meaning, and it appears to us that the force of the plea is undiminished by directing the arguments towards a class not then under consideration, but whose claims for representation in these days occupies a position not dissimilar to that of the poor when George Grote began his career. "The very deficiency in [women] on which the necessity for their present exclusion is founded, demonstrates the vast importance of pressing on the Government peculiar motives to enlighten them. What portrait shall we draw of a Government under which [half of the adults] are so degraded in understanding as to be incapable of forming any opinion on the laws to which their obedience is exacted, and to be destitute therefore of that rational attachment towards them which asserts and seconds so materially the operations of justice? If their stupidity be really so deplorable as to leave them ignorant whether they owe gratitude or execration to their laws and legislators, it is impossible to make exertions too speedily or too strenuous to amend it. Under a Government faithful and energetic in the performance of all its duties, such mental darkness would be rapidly dispelled, and the reason for continued disfranchisement would disappear along with it. But inasmuch as among all duties of Government those which it owes to [women] are most liable to be neglected, the determination of periods for gradually extending to them the suffrage would serve as a spur to quicken inactivity, and as an admonition to prevent forgetfulness. And it is but too possible that a body of representatives perfect and admirable for [men] might be less keenly alive to the importance of elevating the condition and securing the independence of [women]. If they seriously contemplated perpetual disfranchisement—if they considered [women] not as minors, requiring further tuition, but as half-witted by nature and smitten with inherent incapacity—they would be slow in communicating to them acquirements not deemed available to any ultimate end, and only sharpening the sense of an humiliating exclusion.

THE COLLEGE FOR MEN AND WOMEN.—The Working Women's College, 29, Queen Square, Bloomsbury, which, since 1864, has provided education for women in evening classes and lectures, is about to commence another term upon a new basis and under the new title, "The College for Men and Women, with which is incorporated the Working Women's College." The idea of joint education has always formed a part of the scheme in the intention of the originators of the movement; and was encouraged by the late Principal of the Working Men's College, the Rev. F. D. Maurice. The council has now assured itself of the co-operation of its own students, and the assistance of many useful friends, and has determined to admit men to the classes and lectures, and to the social evenings which are an integral part of their programme. The list of lecturers announced includes the names of the Dean of Westminster, Mr. William Spottiswoode, F.R.S., Mr. John Ball, F.R.S., Sir John Lubbock, M.P., Professors J. R. Seeley, Sidney Colvin Clifford, F.R.S., Mr. Henry Sedgwick, Mr. Humphrey Sandwith, C.B., Mr. Thomas Hughes, Q.C., and many others.

THE INFLUENCE OF LADIES AS SCHOOL MANAGERS.

Extract from the General Report for the year 1873, by Her Majesty's Inspector, the Rev. Robert Temple, M.A., on schools inspected by him in Montgomeryshire and Shropshire, and the adjoining counties.

"In most of these schools I find that the teachers are left too much to themselves, without that personal help and superintendence which the members of voluntary committees give. Voluntary committees are usually formed of people who care for children and their education, whereas in many instances the school boards have been chosen for reasons which have nothing to do with love of school work.

"Indeed the great majority of the members of the school boards in my district do not seem to have any idea that it is part of their duty to visit the schools, and take a personal interest in the scholars.

"The school boards are elected, they choose clerks, they discuss, their discussions are published in due form in the county newspapers, they correspond with "my Lords," but there is one thing that for the most part they do not do, and that is, visit their schools. Now it is scarcely possible to exaggerate the injury inflicted on the schools by this neglect.

"The whole working of our system depends upon the control and responsibility of the managers. Teachers as young as most of ours are, need constant supervision, and even where the teachers are experienced, the tendency to routine and to dull methods of merely mechanical instruction will almost always prevail, unless the schools are frequently visited by persons of wider and freer education than most schoolmasters and schoolmistresses possibly can possess.

"One school board there is in my district whose schools are admirably superintended, and that is the only one on which a lady has been elected."

WOMEN AS FARM LABOURERS.

A meeting in connection with the National Labourers' Union was held at Broad Clyst, near Exeter, on October 19th. We take from the Times the following extract, which shows the estimation in which woman is held in the district.

"In the course of his speech the Chairman, Mr. George Mitchell, put a few questions to the men. 'What wage do you get here?' 'I get 2s. 6d. a day,' a man called out, 'with two quarts of cider.' There were cries of 'Ah! but that's more than is paid in most places. Sometimes we only get 10s. or 11s.' 'Are you all paid when you can't work through the wet?' asked the Chairman. There were contradictory replies from the body of the meeting. 'Sometimes.' 'No.'—Chairman: 'Well, you seem better off than you have been, but I believe the women here have been working in the fields for 7½d. and 8d. a day.'—(Several voices: 'Not now.')

PETITIONS.

The following petitions were accidentally omitted from the report published in our last issue:—

WOMEN'S DISABILITIES BILL.—IN FAVOUR.

Table listing petitions for the Women's Disabilities Bill in favour, including names like Hunslet, Chelsea, London, Lambeth, Stanhope, Battersea, Westminster, Leeds, Wandsworth, London, Holbeach, Tiverton, D. Blake, Hackney, Medomsley, Shotley Bridge, Ruthin, and Tiverton.

We earnestly exhort our friends to help the cause by promoting petitions in their several localities. The following is the form recommended:—

To the Honourable the Commons of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of the undersigned

SHREWETH, That the exclusion of women, otherwise legally qualified, from voting in the election of Members of Parliament, is injurious to those excluded, contrary to the principle of just representation, and to that of the laws now in force regulating the election of municipal, parochial, and all other representative governments. Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable House will pass a measure to remove the Electoral Disabilities of Women. And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.

Written petitions ready for signature will be supplied on application to Miss BECKER, 28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE IN THE MIDDLE AGES.—It may be interesting to observe that history has recorded at least one instance of the existence of women's suffrage. The Pyrenean valleys, in the Middle Ages, contained several republics, of which that of Andorre is the only one which has retained its independence to the present day. In at least one of these, that of St. Savin, in the valley of Lavedan, the women possessed a vote in the Deliberative Assembly. The subject is one which deserves, and would perhaps repay, full investigation.—From a Correspondent.

NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS.—Several letters, in type, are unavoidably postponed.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

Contributions to the funds of the Central Committee of the National Society for Women's Suffrage, 294, Regent Street, London, W., from September 15th, to October 20th, 1874.

Table listing contributions to the Central Committee, including names like Mrs. Hargreaves, Mr. Trevelyan, Mrs. Paulton, Mr. Edwin Hill, Mrs. Joseph Crook, Mr. R. K. Wilson, Miss Lawrence, Mrs. Edye, Miss Edye, Mrs. E. Cooper, Mrs. Slobart, Mrs. Barry, Mr. H. Harris, Miss Wilson, Miss H. Wilson, and Miss Blanche Edye.

ALFRED W. BENNETT, Treasurer.

MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS RECEIVED DURING OCTOBER, 1874.

Table listing subscriptions and donations received during October 1874, including names like Mr. H. M. Steintal, Miss Rose Hall, Mrs. Pochin, Mr. Arthur Trevelyan, Mrs. Hy. Gaddum, Mr. Thos. Dale, Mrs. Hetherington, Mr. James Stuart, R. L., Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Dr. Samelson, Mrs. Robinson, Miss Ellen Haydin, Dr. W. Price, The Dowager Countess Buchan, Mrs. Gay, Miss Barnes, Mrs. Medley, Mrs. Williams, The Dowager Lady Lytton, Mrs. A. Watts, Mrs. Plimsaul, Miss Smarey, Mr. W. F. Bramley, Mrs. Barralet, Mr. Joseph Briggs, and Mr. E. N. Baker.

RIPON.

Table listing subscriptions and donations in Ripon, including names like "A Friend", Mrs. Baynes, Mrs. Gatenby, Mrs. Smallpage, E. T., Mr. John Severs, Mrs. Alfred Smith, Mrs. G. Severs, Mrs. Horner, Miss Sarah A. Spence, Mrs. J. B. Lee, Mrs. Milner, Mrs. Walker, Mrs. Ebdell, Mrs. Peacock, Mrs. Morris, Mrs. Hebden, Mrs. Fcx, Mrs. Barker, Mr. W. Thompson, Mrs. W. Thompson, Mrs. Snow, and Mrs. Snowdon.

Carried forward ... 32 5 6

MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS (Continued).

	£	s.	d.
Brought forward	32	5	6
DARLINGTON.			
Mr. Arthur Pease	10	0	0
Mrs. Gurney Pease	5	0	0
Mrs. Fell Pease	2	0	0
"A Friend" Donation	2	0	0
Mrs. S. B. Pease	2	0	0
Mrs. S. B. Pease	1	0	0
Mr. John Morrell	1	1	0
Mr. Wm. Cudworth	1	0	0
Mrs. E. L. Pease Donation	1	0	0
Mrs. Kitching	1	0	0
Mr. John Ross	0	10	0
Mr. Wm. Coor Parker	0	10	0
Mr. J. D. Bell	0	5	0
Mr. Samuel Hare	0	5	0
Mr. G. S. Gibbs	0	5	0
Mr. W. Fothergill	0	5	0
Mr. W. Peachey	0	5	0
Miss H. E. Proctor	0	5	0
Mr. A. Fothergill Donation	0	5	0
Mrs. C. Ianson	0	5	0
Mr. W. Harding	0	5	0
Mr. J. T. Shewell	0	5	0
Mr. W. Foggett	0	3	0
Miss L. Wright	0	3	0
Mr. S. G. Fisher	0	2	6
Mr. Joseph Webster	0	2	6
Miss G. M. Prideaux Donation	0	2	6
Mr. Hy. Brooks	0	2	6
Mr. Edward Hutchinson	0	2	6
Mrs. J. Saunders	0	2	6
Mr. J. M. Sparkes	0	2	6
"A Young Friend"	0	2	0
Mr. J. Wake	0	2	0
Mrs. Wheeler	0	2	0
GRMSBY.			
Mr. Alderman Wintringham	0	10	6
Mr. Councillor Dyer	0	10	6
Mr. Shawson	0	5	0
Mr. Councillor Smethurst, senr.	0	5	0
Mr. Councillor Smethurst, junr.	0	5	0
Mr. Chas. Jeffs	0	5	0
Mr. Councillor Mudd	0	5	0
Mr. H. Mudd	0	5	0
Mr. J. F. Sleight	0	5	0
Mr. Stephenson	0	5	0
Mr. T. W. Ready	0	3	0
Mr. Thorpe	0	3	0
Mr. G. Alward	0	2	6
Anon.	0	2	6
Mr. Gidley	0	2	6
Mr. Jos. Mount	0	2	6
Mr. Geo. Jeffs	0	2	6
Mr. Moody	0	2	6
Mr. John Bridge	0	2	6
Mr. Henry Kelly	0	2	6
Mr. Robt. Sinclair	0	2	6
Mr. Nelson Hooper	0	2	6
Mr. Jos. Johnson	0	2	6
Mr. Melhuish	0	2	6
Mr. R. Smith	0	2	6
Mr. Councillor Wenney	0	2	0
Mr. Saunby	0	2	0
Mr. J. O. Hawke	0	2	0
Mr. James Alward	0	2	0
Mr. Simon Mudd	0	2	0
Mr. Starling	0	2	0
Mr. Geo. Pearce	0	1	0
THIRSK.			
Mr. B. Smith	0	5	0
Mr. Jacques	0	2	6
Mr. J. W. Hall	0	2	6
Mrs. J. W. Hall	0	2	6
Mr. Geo. Ayre	0	2	6
Mrs. Geo. Ayre	0	2	6
Carried forward	69	16	0

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS (Continued).

	£	s.	d.
Brought forward	69	16	0
MIDDLESBOROUGH.			
Mr. E. Williams, Mayor of Middlesborough	1	1	0
Mr. T. Hugh Bell	1	1	0
Mr. R. Stephenson	1	1	0
Mr. Jeremiah Head	1	0	0
Mr. J. Jennings	0	10	6
Mr. William Taylor	0	10	6
Mr. Richard Archibald	0	10	6
Mr. John Jordison	0	10	0
Mr. C. E. Muller	0	10	0
Mr. Thos. Outhwaite Donation	0	5	0
Mr. A. Hedley	0	5	0
Mr. L. Wright	0	5	0
Mr. Charles Bell	0	2	6
Mr. C. MacDermid	0	2	6
Mr. John S. Calvert	0	2	6
Miss H. Purcell Donation	0	2	6
WEST HARTLEPOOL.			
Mr. Cuthbert Emerson	1	0	0
Mr. Charles Thompson	0	10	0
Mr. W. R. Owen	0	10	0
Mr. George Pyman	0	10	0
Mr. Thomas P. Brunton	0	5	0
Mr. W. H. Fisher	0	5	0
Mr. H. G. Fawcus	0	5	0
Mr. H. K. Glendinning	0	5	0
Mr. Thomas Furness	0	5	0
Miss Janet Nicol	0	5	0
Miss Julia Watson	0	5	0
Mr. W. Gibbon	0	2	6
Mr. R. Cochran	0	2	6
Mr. C. Devereux	0	2	6
Mr. Huntrod	0	1	0
HULL.			
Mr. John Thelwall	0	10	6
Mr. Alderman Dowsing	0	10	6
Mr. B. Carlill	0	10	6
Mr. James Stuart	0	10	6
Mr. Thos. Gregson	0	10	6
Mr. E. Elam	0	5	0
Mr. Alfred Frost	0	5	0
Mr. Thos. Witty	0	5	0
Mr. N. Maw	0	5	0
Mr. Stratton	0	5	0
Mrs. S. E. Gregson	0	5	0
Mr. S. Walker	0	5	0
Mr. Geo. Raven	0	5	0
Mr. Thos. Haller	0	2	6
Mr. Hy. Newsam	0	2	6
Mr. Geo. H. Hill	0	2	6
Mr. Robert Micks	0	2	6
Mr. Barnabas Tongue	0	2	6
Mr. Hy. Robinson	0	2	6
Mr. J. G. Carlill (Journal)	0	2	0
Mr. John Glover	0	1	0
NORTHALLERTON.			
Mr. Joseph Brain	0	10	6
Mr. J. Malam	0	10	0
Rev. J. Anderson	0	5	0
Mr. H. T. Akers	0	5	0
Mr. Joseph Stainsby	0	5	0
Mr. W. A. Hutchece	0	5	0
Mr. James Guthrie	0	5	0
Mr. R. M. Middleton	0	5	0
Mr. J. Ord	0	5	0
Mrs. Ayre	0	5	0
Mr. Joseph Fairburn	0	2	6
Mr. G. F. Clarkson	0	2	6
Mrs. Guthrie	0	2	6
Mrs. Tweedie	0	2	6
Mr. T. Ayre	0	2	6
Mrs. Fairburn	0	2	6
Mr. C. Hodgson	0	2	6
Mr. Geo. Dowson	0	2	6
Rev. R. Crookall	0	2	6
Mr. Cooper	0	2	0

S. ALFRED STEINTHAL, Treasurer. £92 4 6

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.