

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

VOL. V.—NO. 53. PUBLISHED MONTHLY.
REGISTERED FOR TRANSMISSION ABROAD.

JULY 1, 1874.

PRICE 1d.—By Post 1½d.

THE Parliamentary intelligence of the newspapers will have conveyed to most of our readers the fact that owing to the appropriation of Tuesdays to Government business, Mr. FORSYTH has been deprived of the expected opportunity of moving the second reading of his Bill. By reference to our report of the proceedings of Tuesday last, the day on which the Bill should have come on, it will be seen that Mr. FORSYTH did his best to obtain from the Prime Minister some assurance that a day would be given for the discussion of this most important Bill, for which, as was pointed out in the question, more than 1,000 petitions, with upwards of 300,000 signatures, have been presented this session, a number of petitioners far exceeding those who have asked for any other measure that has been under the consideration of the House of Commons. Mr. DISRAELI, in his reply, acknowledged the interest of the subject, and assured Mr. FORSYTH that he would assist him if he found it practicable to do so. Should Mr. DISRAELI find himself in a position to extend to Mr. FORSYTH the same consideration in affording him an opportunity for taking the sense of the new Parliament on the electoral disabilities of women, as he has conceded to Mr. BUTT for the discussion of the question of Home Rule in Ireland, the petitions and other efforts of the friends of the cause will have their due weight in influencing the minds of members, who naturally and properly pay great attention and consideration to views expressed by those whom they represent. But should the pressure of public business prevent a discussion this session, the work that has been done will not have been wasted. It has been a manifestation of the strong and growing interest felt in the question, and followed up as it will be by continuous work during the recess, it will tell with accumulated effect on the division which we trust Mr. FORSYTH will be able to secure on an early day after the assembling of Parliament next year.

The explanation of the inability to secure a debate on the appointed day must be sought in the rules of Parliamentary procedure, and the exceptional circumstances of the session. Wednesday is the only day on which a private member can put down the second reading of a

Bill with a certainty that it can come on, and this only when it is the first order of the day. There is, therefore, a general rush of members who have Bills in charge to secure a disengaged Wednesday for them. Priority of choice is determined by ballot. Had Parliament met at the time it was originally summoned for the despatch of business, there would have been the usual number of Wednesdays to choose from, and a reasonable chance afforded of obtaining one for the Bill. But the sudden dissolution of Parliament threw everything into confusion, and the consequent postponement of the assembling of the Legislature for the despatch of business from the sixth of February to the nineteenth of March, cut off six of the number of Wednesdays available for private members, and these six in the most favourable period of the year for discussion. Mr. FORSYTH was at his post at the earliest moment for securing a day, but the chances of the ballot were against him, and he drew an unfavourable number. When the sixteen members to whom the Fates had given precedence had taken their days, the first free Wednesday appeared to be June 17th, which was accordingly chosen; but again the chances were unpropitious, for when the paper came out it appeared that the Bill stood as the second order of the day. The Permissive Prohibitory Liquor Bill had precedence, and was certain to occupy the whole sitting. By this time the succeeding Wednesdays were filled up. Under these circumstances Mr. FORSYTH took the course which seemed to afford the best chance for a discussion on the Bill, and put it down for Tuesday, the 23rd of June, although he was, of course, aware that there were two contingencies which might probably occur to prevent the Bill being brought forward. Tuesdays are reserved for private members' motions, as Wednesdays are for private members' Bills, and there might have been a succession of such notices on the paper the discussion of which would have had precedence of the Bill, and might by the operation of the half-past twelve o'clock rule, have altogether prevented its coming on. Then there was the contingency which has actually occurred, namely, that the Government should appropriate the Tuesdays for its own business, and thereby private

members' Bills and motions which stood for these days be involved in a common sacrifice. Our readers will see from this that there is nothing to cause either surprise or discouragement in the circumstance that we may be unable to secure a debate this session. It has not occurred through any failure on the part of those in charge of the measure to use every effort to obtain a hearing, but is to be attributed solely to the chances to which every member is liable, and to the exceptional character of the session. It is not likely that these contingences will recur; and we have a confident hope of obtaining at an early period next year a debate and division which will afford a fair test of the manner in which our question is regarded by the present Parliament, and an earnest of that success which should always crown persevering effort directed to a just and ennobling end.

We beg to call the attention of our readers to the announcement of the annual meeting of the members and friends of the Central Committee, at the Westminster Palace Hotel, on Monday, July 6th. Mr. FORSYTH, M.P., has consented to preside, and many of the most distinguished supporters of the movement are expected to take part in the proceedings.

MEMORIALS TO MR. DISRAELI AND MR. GLADSTONE.

THE Memorials to Mr. DISRAELI and Mr. GLADSTONE, the text of which we give elsewhere, have been signed by upwards of 18,000 women of the United Kingdom. The list was headed by FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE, followed by HARRIET MARTINEAU, MARY CARPENTER, Lady ANNA GORE LANGTON, Miss THACKERAY, FRANCES POWER COBBE, Mrs. FAWCETT, Dr. GARRETT ANDERSON, Miss ANNA SWANWICK, and many other ladies eminent for intellectual attainments and social position. The Prime Minister, in acknowledging the receipt of the Memorial, said that he felt much honoured by such an offering, and we trust that he will bear in mind the strong claim which a request urged by so many of England's most illustrious daughters, and supported by thousands of their humbler sisters, has upon his favourable consideration.

The presentation of the Memorial to Mr. GLADSTONE has been unavoidably postponed, but it will reach him in the course of a few days, and we hope to record the result in our next issue.

UNIVERSITY EDUCATION FOR WOMEN.

THE Bill introduced by Mr. COWPER-TEMPLE for enabling the Scotch Universities to make such regulations as they may think fit for the admission and complete education of female students, had to be withdrawn through the same cause that has operated in preventing many other Bills of great interest from being brought forward, namely, the short period available for Parliamentary business, owing to the general election and ministerial changes early in the year. Finding that he could not get a day for the Bill, Mr. COWPER-TEMPLE withdrew it, and moved a resolution affirming its principle, on which there was an interesting debate, but the forms of the House prevented a division being taken. The tone of the debate was so favourable that it is believed if a division could have taken place that it would have been of a satisfactory character, and the friends of education are so far encouraged as to be prepared to bring forward a measure next session with good hopes of a favourable issue.

The circumstances which led to the introduction of this Bill are well known, but may be briefly recapitulated. In the year 1869 some young women presented themselves at the University of Edinburgh with the desire of becoming students of medicine, and were received with cordiality and generosity. They were admitted after the gravest deliberations, and by all the authorities of the University. The Medical Faculty passed a resolution in favour of admitting them as students of medicine. The Senators also agreed in the object. The University Court passed a resolution "That under the power given by the Universities Act for making internal improvements, it was the opinion of the University Court such regulation could be made as was necessary for the admission of these ladies as students." The University Council also concurred. The sanction of the Chancellor was given, and that was not merely the sanction of the Chancellor of the University, but of the highest legal authority in Scotland. Lord MONCRIEFF also sanctioned it, and by the unanimous act of the University this regulation was made. All went on well for two years. The ladies attended and were treated with the greatest respect, and no objection was ever raised as to their proficiency or conduct as students. But after they had got over a portion of their course a change came over the spirit of the authorities. One difficulty after another was raised, and at last the Senate began to enunciate that there might be an objection to graduation. On this the ladies took legal proceedings to

declare the position they occupied, and obtain the rights which were generally considered to have been advanced. The suit was adjudged by the LORD ORDINARY, and it went in their favour. But, on appeal, that judgment was reversed by a small majority, and it was affirmed that the University Court, in passing the resolution which led the women students to commence their career at the University, had gone beyond their powers.

The object of the Bill introduced by Mr. COWPER-TEMPLE is to confer on the Universities of Scotland power to educate and grant degrees to women students if they choose to do so. We wish that, in another session, the permissive character of the Bill could be altered. Should it pass in its present form women will be able to obtain education only as a matter of grace and favour in national institutions in which men can obtain it as a right. The Universities which have petitioned Parliament to withhold from them the legal power to educate women, will be slow to avail themselves of such power when forced upon them against their will; and the result would be in all probability another weary and heart-breaking struggle for the means of culture, ending in failure and disappointment without hope of redress. A measure which leaves to the authorities of a University the right to determine absolutely whether women shall or shall not have the educational advantages it affords, places both the Universities and the women in a false position. If women have a right to be educated, they have the same right to the means of education as men. If Parliament interferes at all, it should interfere by establishing for them the same educational rights as it establishes for the rest of the community. The Universities exist for the sake of teaching the people, and all the people who are eligible for instruction therein ought to have equal right to be taught. If Parliament were to decide that women were not eligible for University education there would be no inconsistency in refusing to the Universities power to admit them. But should it decide that they are eligible, it will not be logically consistent if it leaves to the Universities power to exclude them.

When the question of religious tests in the English Universities was at stake, it would not have been deemed a satisfactory solution to pass a measure simply conferring on the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge power to make such regulations as they might see fit to admit those who did not subscribe the thirty-nine articles—but which thereby recognised the right of the Universities to exclude them if they so willed. A Bill which declares

that women may be taught and receive degrees in Universities, and which neglects to secure to them the right of admission to these institutions, is logically incomplete, and will be delusive in its operation. It keeps the word of promise to the ear, and breaks it to the hope, and will have the effect which half-principled and palliative measures always produce, of retarding indefinitely a just and comprehensive settlement of the question.

The Senate of the University of London has had under consideration the recommendation of Convocation that degrees should be granted to women who pass the examination required to qualify men. The numbers were evenly divided, for and against the proposal, and the recommendation was rejected by the casting vote of Earl GRANVILLE.

PARLIAMENTARY INTELLIGENCE.

House of Commons, June 23rd, 1874.

ELECTORAL DISABILITIES OF WOMEN.

Mr. FORSYTH asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether, considering that upwards of 1,000 petitions, containing more than 300,000 signatures, have been presented this session to the House of Commons in favour of the Bill to Remove the Electoral Disabilities of Women, he can hold out any expectation that an opportunity will be afforded for reading the Bill a second time this session.

Mr. DISRAELI: Sir, I am very anxious, so far as it is in my power, to give opportunities to every hon. gentleman who has the care of any question of great interest to bring it forward. But my hon. friend must feel that it is rather premature to press me for any more distinct answer to the question than that. It is only recently that the House has, with much liberality, confided to Her Majesty's Government an increase of opportunity for carrying on the public business. When that is more advanced it will be in my power to speak more distinctly on the subject of specific motions. I have already engaged to give a day to hon. gentlemen opposite for the subject of home rule, and I must not forget that I have an engagement with the hon. member for Londonderry, with regard to the income-tax, and another with an hon. gentleman opposite in reference to the waste land of Ireland. I cannot therefore give any other assurance to my hon. friend except this—that if it is in my power in this case as in every other, it will be most gratifying to me to assist him.

June 12th.

THE MEDICAL EDUCATION OF WOMEN.

Mr. COWPER-TEMPLE rose to call attention to the legal disabilities which have prevented matriculated and registered students of medicine in the University of Edinburgh from completing their education, on account of such students being women, and to move, "That it is expedient that legal powers should be given to the Universities of Scotland to make such regulations as they may think fit for the admission and complete education of female students." The great stride made by education, which had been so remarkable of late years, had

no doubt been chiefly confined to improvements in the schools for boys. Recently we had had brought more prominently before us an opinion of the inefficient manner in which schools for young women, and also those for girls, were conducted, in comparison not only with the way in which they should be conducted, but also in comparison with schools for boys. It could be easily proved, if anyone disputed it, that there would be considerable advantage in improvement to the education provided for girls, particularly as they were excluded from all share in the public institutions of education. We had prejudices to meet. There was that old prejudice, for instance, which for so long prevented the extension of education amongst the lower classes, viz., the idea that if the lower classes were better educated they might learn discontent and become dissatisfied with their position in life, and less amenable to the ordinances of society. This prejudice had exploded, he thought, but a similar one still existed in reference to the education of girls. There were many who thought that if their education were as good and as greatly improved as that of boys had been, it might lead to some greater disaffection and discontent with the ordinances of society on the part of women. He did not want to argue against this, however. It was not necessary to do so, because they could point to experience and facts. There was now in existence in this country and on the Continent a number of instances where the higher education of the Universities had been extended to persons of the female sex. The Universities which had taken the lead in this important matter were the University of London, the University of Cambridge, and the University of Edinburgh. Several years had elapsed since King's College, London, took the lead in establishing a special college for young women. They were taught in King's College, but in separate classes. Well, this experience, such as it was, had been satisfactory. At the present moment there were in the University College of London a considerable number of professors who were endeavouring to extend the benefit of higher and better education to young women. During the past year, in University College, there were about 300 ladies who attended these separate classes, and about 150 who attended the mixed classes of the professors. London University itself had given certificates of efficiency to these ladies, which were intended to be somewhat analogous to the degrees which were conferred upon the males, and he saw that recently at an assemblage of the authorities there was a large party—indeed a majority—of opinion that it was not enough that females should receive certificates of efficiency, but that the time had arrived when the female students in the University who were examined should have the best possible examination and receive degrees. Though the numbers were not great who voted on either side, yet there was every reason to suppose that the majority of those who voted on that occasion really represented the majority of the whole body of the graduates, for not long ago there was a memorial signed by 500 of the graduates of London University College, declaring that the time had come when degrees ought to be given to women. At Cambridge many of the professors had taken a very leading part in trying to extend higher education to women in connection with the teaching of that University. The Cambridge local examinations were conducted and aided by the help and assistance of about ninety students, who were now only studying in separate classes. Out of the public lectures there were twenty-two which were open to young women to attend. Then there was another College at Cambridge, distinctly founded for the exclusive education of young women over the age of eighteen. In that College a system was carried on of discipline and systematic teaching which was framed on the same footing as the older Colleges for men—(hear, hear)—and the result of the

teaching there showed, if anyone had had any doubt of it before, that the female mind was quite as capable of profiting by the instruction imparted at the University as the other sex. At a late examination, two of the lady students, who were examined for the Cambridge classical tripos, were declared to have acquitted themselves in a manner equal to the male candidates who obtained honours. Another in the mathematical tripos obtained such a number of marks as would have placed a male candidate amongst the seniors. So that these results showed that if the full teaching of the Universities were applied to female students, some few of them—he would not say how many, but enough of those who had the capacity and industry—might pass with as much honour and credit as the males. (Hear, hear.) The interpretation, it seemed, that was put upon the statute by which powers were given to the Scotch Universities was the point upon which the illegality was declared, for it appeared by the judgment that the University Court could no longer include among the "internal improvements" the admission of women as well as men, and it did not appear the Act specifically stated anything upon the subject; but the inference was drawn from the other circumstances that the statute should be read in that way. Now, when that Act was passed no question was raised in the House as to whether women would be admitted as well as men to the benefits of the University. Such an idea was not then brought before the public. No one foresaw at that time that women would desire or would present themselves to receive the education of the University. Consequently, in passing that Act they could not say that there was any deliberate intention to exclude women. On the contrary, he thought if this question had been raised, there was reason to suppose if the promoters of that Act had been called upon to decide whether women should receive the benefits of this education as well as men, there could be little doubt from the character of those who promoted the Bill, and the view which would have been taken by Parliament, that it would have been made clear in the Act that the ordinary interpretation clauses which regulated the statute at the present day would have been applied to the Act, and the words used in the masculine gender would have included the feminine as well. We had got into the practice in our legislation of making no invidious exception against women. We desired that law should be as equal as possible, and he was confident that this House would not have deliberately said that the great advantage of university education should be enjoyed exclusively by one sex, that the whole of the benefits of the Universities should be enjoyed by men. Still, whatever might be the opinion of the people who passed that Act, he ventured to think that this House, if the subject had been brought formally before it—and he was very sorry that circumstances had prevented his Bill from reaching that stage at which the House could have decided—the decision of the House would not be that the exclusive principle was the best, but that so far as principle was concerned they should throw open as widely as possible these educational institutions to women. He had no doubt that each University was amply able to make such regulations as they might think advisable to prevent any abuse or any disadvantage accruing to it. They were not there to enter into those domains which properly belonged to the Universities. They were there to declare that in those Universities in the north of this island where a statute had passed giving authority to regulate the admission of students there should be no exclusion, but that all of whatever sex might be admitted according to such regulations as the University might make. He was sure there could be no sound policy, from a national point of view, in discouraging the desire for education on the part of women; and

there could be no good in preventing that spirit of mental activity which was now beginning to be manifested. He did hope, therefore, that the Government might take this matter into their consideration. It was a matter which it behoved the Government to undertake. They perceived the great hardship inflicted, he might say the great scandal perpetrated, in connection with the University of Edinburgh. He meant that the University, believing that it had legal powers, had invited into its halls students whom it had afterwards to reject, because it discovered that it had not the powers which it believed it had. He was sure the Government could easily solve the difficulty. If women desired at present to obtain degrees, they must go across the Channel to France or America, anywhere rather than to their own land, because England was the only one of the chief countries in Europe where it was impossible for them to obtain these degrees. (Hear, hear.) If they might take the estimation in which women were held, if they might take the position of women as a test of the civilisation of a country, then he was sorry to say that England did not stand high in that respect in comparison with other countries, and he hoped the day was not distant when that reproach might be removed from our country, and this grievance which he had attempted to explain might be redressed. (Cheers.)

The motion was opposed by Sir Wyndham Anstruther, and the debate was continued by Mr. Cameron, Dr. Lyon Playfair, Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Beresford Hope, Mr. W. Williams, Sir E. Colebrooke, Sir W. Stirling Maxwell, Mr. McLaren, Mr. Henley, the Lord Advocate, and Sir F. Goldsmid, and the subject dropped.

PUBLIC MEETINGS.

IRELAND. BANDON.

A meeting, in furtherance of the above subject, was held on May 21st, in the Town Hall, Bandon, which was crowded, the admission being free, except a few reserved seats, for which a charge of sixpence was made. On the motion of Mr. Hueston, seconded by Mr. W. C. Dowden, the chair was taken by James Colclough Allman, Esq., after which a resolution was moved by Miss Beedy, seconded by Miss Tod, and supported by Miss Helena P. Downing, niece of Mr. McCarthy Downing, M.P. Miss Downing, in supporting the resolution, said she could not understand how this question was not taken up long ago. If she had a large property she should pay taxes, and if she failed to do so the rate collector would come into her house and take her goods. Surely she ought to have a voice in the disposal of those taxes. She knew an instance where a widow was put out of her farm because she had not a vote at the disposal of her landlord, and she heard that in this very town a woman was put out of her shop and business for the same reason. There were 3½ millions of women earning their livelihood in these countries, noble women who ought to have a voice in the election of members of Parliament. It has been said that women don't care for it. There was a time in our history when as many men as now had not the franchise; little by little they got it, and now they would not part with it. It has been said that women would neglect their business. She would relate an occurrence that took place a short time ago. Mrs. Arnold wanted to get on a school board in England. One gentleman, whose support she solicited, said he would vote for her if she answered three questions. She said she would. "Well then," says he, "Will not Mr. Arnold be lonesome when you are at the school board; will not the children be neglected, and, lastly,

who will mend Mr. Arnold's stockings?" Mrs. Arnold answered: "Mr. Arnold is out from nine o'clock in the morning until night, and it is I that ought to complain of being lonely; secondly, there are no children to be neglected; and, lastly, Mr. Arnold's stockings never want mending, for I knit them myself." (Laughter.) She thanked them for the attention paid them, which she felt as a compliment to herself, being connected with the district by family ties. She had great pleasure in supporting the resolution. The chairman then put the resolution, which was carried with acclamation, and the meeting concluded with a vote of thanks to the chairman.

CLONMEL.

A delegation from the Women's Suffrage Association visited Clonmel, and on May 22nd a public meeting, under the auspices of the Right Worshipful Alderman E. Cantwell, Mayor, came off at the Court House at eight o'clock. Though the admission was by ticket the attendance from the town and the surrounding districts was unusually large and select, the fair sex, however, be it observed, being in a vast preponderance. Though the proceedings were novel, the ladies were accorded an enthusiastic welcome, and treated with a gallantry befitting the capital of Tipperary. The deputation consisted of Miss Beedy; Miss Tod, of Belfast; and Miss Downing, of London. The last-mentioned lady, as is generally known, is niece to Mr. McCarthy Downing, M.P. for the county Cork. The Court House was crowded in every direction long previous to the hour fixed upon for having the proceedings commence; and the advent of the ladies, headed by his worship the Mayor, Gerald Fitzgerald, Esq. (Sub-Sheriff), the Rev. Mr. Beattie, and the Rev. Mr. Orr, was hailed with loud applause. His Worship introduced the deputation in appropriate terms, after which Miss Downing read a letter of apology from Mr. Bagwell, who had when in Parliament uniformly supported the Bill, and the usual resolutions were afterwards moved and supported by the ladies of the deputation and others on the platform and carried. Votes of thanks to the deputation and the chairman concluded the proceedings.

WATERFORD.

A public meeting was held on May 25, in the City Hall, Waterford. The lady delegates present were Miss Tod, Belfast, Miss H. P. Downing, and Miss Beedy. The proceedings were announced to commence at eight o'clock, but long before that hour the room was densely crowded with a highly appreciative audience, which included many ladies and gentlemen of high position in the city and neighbourhood. At shortly after eight o'clock the ladies entered the room, accompanied by the Right Worshipful Ald. W. K. Commins, Mayor; Ald. St. George Freeman, J.P., ex-Mayor; Aldermen P. A. Power, J.P., and C. Redmond; Archdeacon Ryland, and Rev. Mr. Burrows; George Walpole, T.C.; Dr. Elliott, Dr. Condell, &c., &c. The entrance of the lady delegates and their friends was the signal for an outburst of cheering, which was renewed again and again as his worship the Mayor took the chair. Mr. E. S. Kenney read a letter from Mr. R. Power, M.P., city of Waterford, regretting his inability to be present, but adding that he shall have much pleasure in supporting the measure whenever it comes before Parliament. The first resolution was proposed by Miss Beedy, and seconded by Alderman P. A. Power, J.P.—Mr. J. Fisher offered some objection, after which the Mayor put the resolution to the meeting, and declared it carried amid great cheering.—The second resolution was moved by Miss Tod, seconded by Alderman Freeman, supported by Miss Downing, and carried unanimously, with applause.—Votes of thanks to the deputation and the chairman concluded the proceedings.

DUBLIN.

A conference was held in the Leinster Hall, Dublin, on 30th May, of friends interested in this question. G. Johnston Stoney, Esq., M.A., in the chair. It was influentially attended; and, after addresses by Miss Beedy, Miss Tod, and Miss Downing, arrangements were made for petitioning and other work.

ENGLAND.

WEDNESBURY.

On June 12th a meeting was held in the Town Hall, Wednesbury, "to advocate the extension of the electoral franchise to those householders who are at present excluded solely on account of being women." There was a large and respectable audience. The chair was taken by the Rev. R. B. Feast, of West Bromwich, and there were also on the platform Miss Sturge and Mrs. Ashford, of Birmingham, the Rev. T. G. Crippen and Mrs. Crippen, of Oldbury, and Mr. W. Lester. Resolutions affirming the principle and adopting petitions were supported by the above-named ladies and gentlemen and carried, and votes of thanks concluded the proceedings.

HARROW.

THE WEST MIDDLESEX BRANCH OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

A very crowded and influential meeting of this branch of the National Society for Women's Suffrage was held on Monday last in the New Public Hall. A. Treslove Cox, Esq., (hon. sec. of the Harrow Liberal Union) occupied the chair. The lady speakers were Miss Caroline Biggs, Miss Fenwick Miller, Mrs. George Sims (the hon. sec. of the West Middlesex Branch of the Society), and Miss Babb; and the gentlemen speakers were C. Colbeck, Esq., M.A., and F. E. Marshall, Esq., M.A. (both masters of Harrow School), and Thomas Reed, Esq. The audience was extremely enthusiastic, and listened with the most respectful attention to the lady speakers. The first resolution, approving of women's suffrage, was carried by an overwhelming, but not a unanimous vote, every one present having been exhorted to vote one way or the other; but the second resolution, that petitions be presented to Parliament in accordance with the first resolution, was carried unanimously. After a cordial vote of thanks to the chairman the meeting broke up.

Miss Craigen addressed meetings on May 11th, in the Templar's Hall, WIGTON, Cumberland; on May 17th in the Primitive Methodist Chapel, HALTON SEA GALE, Cumberland; and on May 26th, in the Town Hall, HALTWHISTLE, Northumberland; and on May 27th, in the Primitive Methodist Chapel, WEST COANWOOD. Petitions were adopted at all these meetings. On June 2nd Miss Craigen lectured in the Free Methodist Chapel, NEWBROUGH, near Hexham; the meeting was crowded to the doors, and great interest shown, and the petition was carried unanimously. The chair was occupied by Mr. J. W. Hetherington, of Haydon Bridge, who said he had no idea previously of the legal position of women or the abuses that existed, and he thought most people in Newbrough were in the same state of ignorance on the question till now; but after what they had heard he thought that it was the duty of every woman to work in this cause, and of every man to help. There had been some doubts as to the propriety of holding these meetings in their chapels, but that was cleared now, in his mind at any rate, and he hoped that every Methodist chapel in the country would be at the service of the advocates of women's suffrage if they needed them, as he thought the cause was identified with religion and morality. There was much applause at this, and the meeting concluded with the usual votes of thanks.

MR. FRESHFIELD, M.P., ON WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

The following letter has been addressed by Mr. Freshfield, M.P. for Dover, to a lady resident in that town.

"9, Eastern Terrace, Brighton, March 7th, 1874.

"Dear Madam,—I have read with attention the papers you were good enough to send me, with your able and well reasoned letter of the 27th ult., which I should have answered before, but that I have been absent from this, my temporary place of residence, and engaged the whole week in town.

"The arguments you have used and the analogy you refer to of the rights already conceded to women, in the cases of Municipal and School Board elections are, I think, conclusive in favour of the principle of extending the right to vote in Parliamentary elections.

"I think the general view taken by the sex is an ingredient in the question, because all changes of this nature must affect their condition and status in society, though, no doubt, it may fairly be argued that one person should not be denied a right because others object to the grant of it.

"You will collect from what I have written that my impression, subject to my views on this point, are favourable to the change in the law which you advocate, and I hope that you will be satisfied with this expression of opinion, as I am reluctant to give a pledge for any course of action under circumstances not fully before me.—I am, dear Madam, faithfully yours,
"Mrs. Florence W. Wakefield. C. K. FRESHFIELD."

PHYSICAL EDUCATION OF WOMEN.

Four hundred men were saved alive from the wreck of the Atlantic, and one boy of twelve years of age: but not a single woman was saved. No especial effort was made to save the boy. He saved himself by a judicious use of his feeble strength. But many men made gallant efforts to save their wives, their sweethearts, and their daughters. Why the total failure? The answer is plain. The women could not swim. The women could not climb. The women could not cling to a rope stretched from the ship to the shore. A little feeble boy could climb the rigging, could crawl along a rope, could safely drop from the height into a rocking boat; but the women could do nothing useful to themselves or others. Yet if the ship had been filled with barbarians, as many women as men, proportionally, would have reached the shore. Our boasted civilization and the decrees of fashion and mis-called propriety murder women whenever an emergency arrives which reduces all caught in a great catastrophe for "ladies and gentlemen," to a dependence upon animal strength, dexterity, cool courage, muscular and mental resources capable of battling with the elements. There never was a more terrible lesson of the dangerous folly, not to say the criminal wickedness of our civilization in trying to make of a woman a helpless, weak, and defenceless creature.—*The Pioneer* (San Francisco.)

WOMEN IN ASHANTEE.

At a banquet given by the Lord Mayor of London, on March 30, Sir Garnet Wolsley said:—We knew that our allies could not be depended upon. We knew, in fact, that they were a cowardly people. The ladies here will be pleased to hear that the women were better than the men. When I first read that the king of Dahomey had female warriors I was amused, but I can fully appreciate his feelings now, and consider that he showed great wisdom in choosing women instead of men.

MR. GOLDWIN SMITH ON WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

The opponents of women's suffrage are in great exultation at the appearance of an article in the June number of "Macmillan's Magazine," from the pen of Mr. Goldwin Smith, in which he assails with much energy the claim of women to any share in the choice of Parliamentary representatives. That Mr. Goldwin Smith is still opposed to women's suffrage will surprise no one, but it is probable that the weapons he uses in his attack will surprise both those who sympathise with the claim of women to representation and those who dissent from it. The article, which may be fitly described as a series of brilliant paragraphs, is to a very great extent filled with arguments and observations, which are entirely irrelevant to the question of women's suffrage as it exists in England at the present day. Not indeed that the article is entirely filled with such, but they occupy a very prominent position, and almost crowd the arguments that are really forcible and relevant to the subject out of sight. We had been accustomed to think of Mr. Smith as the great apostle of Radicalism, to regard him as filled with a kind of religious enthusiasm for political revolutions, to listen for his voice as that of one crying in the wilderness. When he left England for the United States and the United States for Canada, it was believed that his movements were prompted by his political fastidiousness, and that he is still in search of an earthly paradise where there shall be no aristocracy, no political corruption, and none of the ordinary imperfections of common humanity. We therefore expected that when he rebuked us for asking for some share in the representation of our country, it would have been in a manner at once solemn, authoritative, and to the point. Instead of which he talks like Mr. Beresford Hope. "The very foundations of society are touched," he says, "when party tampers with the relations of the sexes." Mrs. Victoria Woodhull is held up as a scarecrow to frighten all sensible women who have so far forgotten themselves as to ask for Parliamentary representation. The exclusion of women from professions is alluded to, apparently for the object of bringing in a bit about "the women under the Roman empire, who began to play the gladiator when other excitements were exhausted." And finding the style of the member for the University of Cambridge so easy of imitation, he concludes the paragraph by drawing an imaginative picture of the state of the law, if women as well as men were admitted to the profession. The passage about the "pretty advocate appealing to a jury, &c.," is not in the style that we are accustomed to from Mr. Smith.

It is however needless to dwell at any length on these well-worn methods of argument against the admission of women householders to the suffrage; but it may fairly be asked by those who think that the women who contribute to all the burdens of the state should be allowed to exercise the franchise, in what way the demand for women's suffrage is affected by the fact that Mrs. Alphra Behn was a licentious writer of the time of Charles II.; that in America some women have been so foolish as to claim "not only political equality, but absolute supremacy over man;" that Mr. Smith has been told, on good authority, that somewhere in the United States, there is a woman who compels her husband to work for her as a hired labourer; and that in the United States the State Legislatures (composed of, and entirely elected, it must be remembered, by men), "have already carried freedom of divorce so far, that the next step would be the total abolition of marriage, and the destruction of the family." As Mr. Smith himself states most clearly and forcibly, that women have much more to lose than men, by weakening the stringency of the marriage tie, it might be supposed that women's suffrage is needed in America in order to restore to marriage in that country some of the fixity and permanence of which the legislatures, chosen by men, have robbed

it. But Mr. Smith implies that women's suffrage is demanded in order to obtain greater freedom of divorce. It will be universally conceded that there is no shadow of truth in this implication, so far as it applies to England. There is no feeling in England on the part of those who advocate women's suffrage in favour of weakening the permanence of the marriage tie, and any implication to the contrary simply serves to betray the animus of those who make it. Most women, whether they wish for the suffrage or not, are in favour of making the law of divorce, what it is not at present, equal between husband and wife. As the law now stands, for a certain offence committed by a wife, her husband can obtain a divorce; for exactly the same offence committed by a husband, the wife cannot obtain a divorce. To wish to see this injustice removed surely betrays no desire to obtain greater freedom of divorce, and it is, to say the least, disingenuous to attempt to bring disgrace on the women's suffrage party, by associating with it principles which it abhors.

Mr. Smith is apparently annoyed by the moderation of those who advocate women's suffrage. He would be much better pleased if the immediate enfranchisement of all women were demanded, instead of the mild proposal now before Parliament to enfranchise widows and spinsters who possess the requisite qualification. This limitation, he says, of the suffrage to unmarried women, would make marriage "politically penal." Is it not obvious, to adopt the same phraseology, that the exclusion of all women from representation is to treat sex as "politically penal?" But to pass this by, it appears that the narrow dimensions of Mr. Forsyth's Bill deprive Mr. Smith's arguments of most of their force; so he ignores these self-imposed limitations and denounces the extension of the suffrage to married women, as "the most momentous step that could be taken by any legislature;" one which would "authorize a wife . . . to act publicly in opposition to her husband," . . . which would fling into the political cauldron "female character and home;" and which would introduce into home life a new source of discord, under which the husband would become so desperate that if "he cared for his own happiness he would be apt to say that if his wife wanted it she might have the vote, but that there should only be one vote between them." To this it is only possible to repeat what everybody knows, that Mr. Forsyth's Bill does not propose to enfranchise wives; and if it can be shown that all these evil consequences would follow their enfranchisement, it will not be difficult to resist any future demand that may be made on behalf of married women for representation. In the same spirit of wilfully neglecting the facts before him, Mr. Smith says that because there are some women eminently capable of understanding and discussing political questions, "it by no means follows that it is expedient to put political power into the hands of the whole sex." When any sane person asks for a Universal Womanhood Suffrage Bill, there will be some point in this argument, but not till then.

There is another matter in which the women's suffrage party have, by the moderation of their aims, deprived Mr. Smith's denunciations of their sting. At the last presidential election in the United States, a Mrs. Victoria Woodhull was nominated by some foolish persons as a candidate for the office of president. Her candidature was received with the contempt it deserved by the women's suffrage party in America. But this, says Mr. Smith, "only showed that they had not considered the consequences of their own principles." We may ask in return what inconsistency there is in thinking that the risk of evil would be small, and the accompanying benefit great, in allowing women to exercise the Parliamentary suffrage, whereas the risk of evil would be very large, and the accompanying benefit either absent altogether, or so inconsiderable as to be practically absent, if women become candidates in a presidential election.

A similar reply may be made to those who say, with Mr. Smith, that women's suffrage would necessarily lead to women taking seats in Parliament. We ask for women's suffrage on the ground that the good following from it would more than compensate any risk of evil that may accompany that good. No one who holds this opinion is bound because he holds it to think that in the present state of society the good of having women in Parliament would preponderate over the harm caused by it. The exclusion of men in holy orders from Parliament is a case in point. Clergymen may vote for members of Parliament, but they are prohibited as long as they retain orders from sitting in Parliament; and this prohibition is based on grounds of public utility. If women were admitted to the suffrage, there would be no reason why they should not continue to be excluded from the House of Commons. Mr. Smith himself maintains that the granting of one kind of political privilege to women does not logically necessitate the granting of further privileges of a higher order; for he contends that the extension of the School Board and municipal franchises to women affords no ground for admitting them to the Parliamentary suffrage. How, while expressing this opinion, he can affirm that if women had the suffrage it would be necessary to admit them to the House of Commons, it is difficult to perceive. If there is no necessity in the one case, there is certainly none in the other. So far as the fulfilment of her domestic and social duties is concerned, it would make little difference to a woman already possessed of the School Board and municipal suffrage if she were permitted to record her vote once in every four or five years for a member of Parliament. But the whole routine of her life would be revolutionised if she were in Parliament; and it may fairly be argued by those most warmly in favour of women's suffrage that such a revolution is eminently undesirable. At the time of Catholic emancipation it was maintained that if the disabilities of Catholics were removed it would be logically impossible to exclude Catholics from the throne. The English people, with characteristic common sense, snapped their fingers at such logic, and one disability was removed because it was practically injurious to the best interests of the nation; and another was retained because more good than harm resulted from its maintenance. Is it impossible to hope that the disabilities of women may be treated in the same way, and that the suffrage, which we do ask for, will not be refused to us on the ground that if we get it we shall also be forced to accept, what we do not ask for, seats in Parliament?

The arguments against women's suffrage already referred to, may be looked upon as little more than the smoke which accompanies the discharge of Mr. Smith's musket. The real strength of his attack lies in the assertion that women are reactionary in politics, and that their votes would lead to the demolition of free institutions, the downfall of free government, and the suppression of liberty of opinion. In a passage of genuine eloquence, he describes the birth of elective government, and all the struggles and agony which have attended its existence. "Those," he says, "to whose hands it is committed at this crisis, are trustees for posterity of a heritage bought by ages of effort and torrents of blood; and they are bound to allow neither their own ambition nor that of any one else, if they can help it, to imperil the safety of their trust. That women would be likely to vote for one set of aspirants to political office rather than for the opposite set, would be a very bad reason for withholding from them the suffrage, even for a day; but that they would probably overturn the institutions on which the hopes of the world rest, is as good a reason as there well could be for withholding anything from anybody." It is impossible for any argument against women's suffrage to be put better than this; if women, by their votes, would overturn the institutions on which the hopes of the world rest, so

far from wishing them to have the suffrage, it would be better that a millstone were hanged about their necks, and that they were drowned in the midst of the sea. But the weight of the whole argument rests upon the "if." And what shadow of proof is there that women would give up all that has been gained by the political struggles of the last two hundred years? Would they re-institute the Star Chamber? would they wish to be taxed by an irresponsible and absolute monarch? Would they make some Pope of their own creating supreme over the destinies of England? It is not pretended that they would do any of these things. After detailing with considerable minuteness "the course the demolition of free institutions by female suffrage would take" in the United States and in France, Mr. Smith turns to England. And it may be here observed, that he is rather timid when he draws his illustrations from current English politics. It may be the result of living abroad, but he seems much more confident when he is speaking of the effect women's suffrage would have had in the civil war in the time of Charles I., or when he refers to Mrs. Alpha Behn, who has been dead and forgotten these two hundred years, or in telling us all the dreadful things that women do in the United States, than when he speaks of the England of to-day. "A female vote" he tells us, would have been suicidal to the cause of liberty in the time of Charles I. "Female" suffrage in the United States would probably lead to the election and re-election, as President, of some woman's favourite, till his power became personal and perhaps dynastic. In France women would restore the Bourbons, bring France back to the state it was in before the Revolution, and lead a religious crusade against German Protestantism and Italian freedom. These are the portentous changes which women would bring about in France and the United States. What would they do in England? It is satisfactory to find that women's power of being mischievous appears to be confined to much narrower limits in England than elsewhere. We should vote, Mr. Smith tells us, with the minority in favour of the Permissive Bill, or, perhaps, even for the Maine Liquor Law, and with the majority for maintaining the religious character of national education. We heave a deep sigh of relief when we know that Mr. Smith's prophetic vision of the ills wrought by women's suffrage in England only amounts to this. It is a comfort to know the worst, especially when the worst is not so very bad. Our case is like that of a man who goes to a surgeon thinking he must have his leg cut off, and is recommended instead to take a scidnitz powder. It appears then that the women's vote in England would sever the alliance, so profitable to the Tory party at the late election, between Beer and the Bible. The cry of "Our National Church and our National Beverage" would not rally the women voters to the polls. But it would be doing Mr. Smith an injustice to insinuate that his objections to women's suffrage are based on the effect it would have in excluding this or that party from office. So far as women's suffrage would sever the connection between Beer and the Bible we suppose he would be glad; but he states that if women by their votes converted the minority in favour of restrictive liquor laws into a majority, and extreme prohibitory measures against the sale of liquor were carried, men would refuse to obey these enactments, "and the consequence would probably be contempt, and perhaps open defiance, of the law" and the subsequent break-down of elective government. Women's suffrage would, it is urged, separate the legislative force of the nation from its physical force. Men would refuse to submit to laws made by women, who had not the power to enforce their execution, and government would be overturned. This argument assumes many things that are contrary to fact. First, that the women proposed to be enfranchised could, if they would, cause laws to be passed, which are "in contradiction

to the male sense of justice." The number of voters added to the electorate under Mr. Forsyth's Bill would vary in different constituencies from a fifth to an eighth. A minority of a fifth or an eighth will be very powerful in elections if it acts in accordance with "the male sense of justice;" it will be absolutely powerless, even at the polls, if the "male sense of justice" is opposed to it. With a majority of seven-eighths or even four-fifths against them, women would not be able to carry laws unjust and oppressive to men. There is a physical security against this danger even if there be no moral security, as we believe there is, in the fact that a "sense of justice" may be found in feminine as well as masculine minds. The support which women's suffrage has found among men of all parties has been gained mainly by appealing to the "male sense of justice;" women are not likely, when they are enfranchised, to forget the lesson they have learned during this struggle—that much can be done by a temperate appeal to the sense of justice of the community, and nothing can be done without it. But the argument used by Mr. Smith assumes that the system of government of this country is now at the present time in the hands of a majority of the physical force of the community. Some facts point the other way. The adult male population of the United Kingdom is rather over 6,000,000. The registered electors are 2,764,285. Those actually represented in the House of Commons, taking into consideration those who do not go to the poll, may be estimated at about half of those on the register. A majority of the members returned by these 1,380,000, may pass or reject laws and modify the legislation of the country in any way they please. Even if every member represented a constituency of equal size, there would be no guarantee under such a system that legislative changes were supported by the majority of the physical force of the country. But under our present system of representation one member is returned by 20,000 voters, another is returned by 120 voters, and the power of the second is as great in a division as that of the first. It has been calculated by those interested in this subject, that in many divisions in the House of Commons, the minority in Parliament represents more voters than those represented by the majority. Even now therefore it frequently happens that legislative action is not supported by a majority of the physical force of the country. The government is, of course, known to have the command of the army; but the laws which would otherwise be resisted could not in this country be permanently maintained by force of arms. And it must also be remembered that the army, whatever its support may be worth, would be at the command of a Parliament partly elected by women's votes, as much as it now is at the command of a Parliament elected entirely by men. The argument that government rests on physical force, also seems to ignore the existence of two out of the three estates of the realm. The constitution of the House of Commons does not guarantee the predominance of the physical force of the country; but the House of Lords can and often does veto measures supported by large majorities in the other House and in the country. Its power in this way is theoretically unlimited; practically it is only limited by fear of provoking a revolution. Here, it may be said, is the basis of physical force on which its power rests; but it surely cannot be contended that an assembly represents the physical force of the community because it is in extreme cases controlled by the dread of that physical force. The existence of the House of Lords forms a much more real separation between the legislative power and the physical force of the community than would be caused by the enfranchisement of those women who possess the qualifications required of the male electors. And yet the Upper House does not produce all the dire consequences predicted by Mr. Smith as likely to follow the separation of legislative power and physical force.

Our criticism of Mr. Smith's arguments has already reached too great a length, but we cannot forbear, in conclusion, from referring to the generous manner in which he recognises that there are various legal and social enactments that press unjustly on women. He alludes, especially, to the law of property, and to the social restrictions which close many professional and industrial careers to women. Of those women who wish to open new careers for their sex, he says, "the utmost sympathy is due to them, and every facility ought in justice to be afforded them." But he urges that these grievances are in process of demolition, and that women will gradually share with men all the benefits of free institutions. As an example of what we already have to be thankful for, he reminds us that less than a hundred years ago women as well as men were in France broken alive on the wheel for theft. Women have thus fully shared in the benefits arising from a diminution in the barbarity of punishments. A Bill has also been passed in this country to remove some of the anomalies relating to the property of married women. Hence it is inferred that wherever the law is unjust to women the injustice will be removed without giving women votes. If Mr. Smith believed the contrary to be the fact he would support women's suffrage. "Of course," he says, "if there is wrong to half humanity, which cannot be righted in any other way, we must at once accept Female Suffrage, whatever perils it may entail." It is curious that after making this admission Mr. Smith should in the same page give instances of the blundering manner in which existing legislatures, with the best intentions, have endeavoured to remedy injustices to women. The Married Women's Property Act has been pronounced by one of the Vice-Chancellors to be perfectly unintelligible; as an instance of its inconsistency it may be mentioned that it removes the liability of a husband to be sued for debts contracted by his wife before marriage, without giving the unfortunate creditor power to sue the wife for these debts. It does not ensure to a wife the possession of any of her property other than her earnings. So that a man on marriage becomes the possessor of his wife's property without incurring the responsibility of her debts incurred before marriage. This Act is hardly a favourable specimen of the redress which women's grievances are likely to receive without women's suffrage. But in the United States, Mr. Smith tells us, male legislatures, in dealing with the property of married women, have erred on the other side: they "display an exaggerated propensity to sever the interests of the wife from that of the husband." Could we have two more striking instances of the need of women's suffrage? We here have the picture of the legislatures of two different countries honestly endeavouring to redress a state of the law that is injurious to women. In one country the result is that the law is made unintelligible and more anomalous than it was before; in the other the legislature severs the interest of husband and wife, and thereby introduces a remedy worse than the disease. We believe that the very large majority of men are perfectly willing to do justice to women; but the present state of the law is in many most vitally important respects flagrantly unjust to women. What conclusion is to be naturally drawn from these considerations? That the only way to effectually protect the interests of the persons who labour under these injustices is to give them the power to protect themselves. It is idle to pretend that the injustices which are admitted to exist arise from any hostility between men and women. They always have been, and always will be, united to each other by the strongest bonds which human affection is capable of making. We do not ask for the suffrage for women in any spirit of ill-will or suspicion. We do not even ask for it simply for the better protection of our own interests. We ask for it because we believe it will add a new current to the tide of the best life of the nation—that it will be good for

women to feel that they too are "trustees for posterity of a heritage bought by ages of effort and torrents of blood," and that men will find that "it is not good to be alone" even in politics.
MILLICENT GARRETT FAWCETT.

SIR HENRY JAMES AND THE LADIES OF TAUNTON.

The following correspondence has taken place between Sir Henry James and a lady residing in Taunton:—

"Rosemount, Bishop's Hall, Taunton,
"20th May, 1874.

"Sir,—A committee of ladies who have procured the signatures of 300 women householders of Taunton to a petition in favour of the Bill to Remove the Electoral Disabilities of Women, take the liberty of requesting that you will do them the favour of presenting it to the House of Commons.

"I have much pleasure in forwarding this request and the petition to you, feeling assured you will be glad of an opportunity to redeem the promise you made in your speech of the 9th October, 1873, when you were good enough to say: 'There are a great many ladies in Taunton, and when one-half of them appeal to me to support female suffrage I will do it, because I shall then know that I am acting in accordance with the sympathies and feelings of the country.' I am quoting from the *Daily Telegraph* of the 10th October, 1873. The number of women householders in Taunton is 562; I have, therefore, the satisfaction of sending you several names more than the required half.

"Will you oblige us all by presenting our petition, and giving us your vote and support on the second reading of the Bill, according to your kind promise?—I have the honour to be, sir, yours faithfully,
"F. E. M. NOTLEY.

"Sir Henry James, M.P."

"New Court, Temple, May 22, 1874.

"Madam,—I will present the petition you refer to, as I should any other forwarded to me from the locality of Taunton.

"The Bill for the Removal of the Electoral Disabilities of Women, however, will receive my most strenuous opposition—as strenuous as the opposition the advocates of women's suffrage afforded to me at my election in October last.

"I do not recognise the words you quote as being those spoken by me. Even if they were, one half of the ladies of Taunton have not appealed to me to support female suffrage.—I am, madam, your obedient servant,
"HENRY JAMES.
"Mrs. Notley."

MEMORIALS TO MR. DISRAELI AND MR. GLADSTONE.

The following is the text of the Memorials which have been signed by upwards of 18,000 women of the United Kingdom.

To the Right Honourable BENJAMIN DISRAELI, M.P., First Lord of Her Majesty's Treasury.

Sir,—

We, the undersigned Women of Great Britain and Ireland, desire to offer you our earnest thanks for the favourable reply you were pleased to give to our Memorial of last year, and for your votes in the House of Commons in favour of the Bill to Remove the Electoral Disabilities of Women.

We invoke your aid to secure the boon of representative and constitutional government. We have a grateful remembrance of the fact that you were the first member of the House of Commons to declare within its walls your assent to the justice of the claim of Women to representation, and we hold that it would be a fitting and graceful conclusion that you, who were a pioneer of our cause, should bring, as we believe that you have power to bring, such aid as would crown it with success.

We therefore respectfully and earnestly entreat that you will, on behalf of Her Majesty's Government, give your support to the measure proposed in the House of Commons for removing the Electoral Disabilities of Women.

To the Right Honourable WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE, M.P.

Sir,—

We, the undersigned women of Great Britain and Ireland, respectfully urge on your attention the claim of women who are householders, ratepayers, and owners of property to the exercise of the electoral franchise annexed by law to the qualifications which they possess.

We are mindful of the circumstance that you have in your place in Parliament stated that there are various important particulars in which women obtain much less than justice under social arrangements, and that since those words were uttered attempts have been made to amend the law in some of these particulars, which attempts have failed, either through neglect or opposition. In the same speech you stated that there was a presumptive ground for some change in the law, and that in many cases, such as in the competition for farms, women suffer in a very definite manner from want of the qualification to vote. You stated also that if it should be found possible to arrange a safe and well-adjusted alteration of the law as to political power, the man who should attain that object, and should see his purpose carried onward to its consequences in a more just arrangement of the provisions of other laws bearing upon the condition and welfare of women, would be a real benefactor to his country.

We believe that these conditions are exactly fulfilled by the Bill now before the House of Commons. This Bill is approved and accepted by the most thoughtful and earnest women of the country as a satisfactory solution of the problem how best to bring the special interest and the special knowledge of women to bear in influencing the Legislature, and has been petitioned for, session after session, by many hundreds of thousands of persons.

The Bill has secured an increased support each year that it has been submitted to Parliament, and has received more votes than have been given for any measure which has not been adopted by one or the other of the great parties in the State. No other proposal for the reform of the representation has been so long before Parliament, or has received such extended support. It appears, therefore, to have an equal if not a prior claim for acceptance to that of any other bill for extending the application of the principle of household suffrage.

We, therefore, earnestly beg that you will give your support to the Bill to Remove the Electoral Disabilities of Women, and exert your influence in order to secure its passing into law.

REVIEW.

Mildred's Career (by Miss Ramsay).—A tale of the women's suffrage movement. One volume. Published by C. Skeet, King William-street, Charing Cross. 1874.

The author of this interesting and pleasantly-written story has endeavoured to portray some of the more disadvantageous social aspects of the working of the theory of the dependence of women which are but too common in real life. The position of ladies brought up in luxury and refinement and suddenly reduced to penury by the death or failure of those on whom they depended is a hard prosaic fact of constant occurrence, conveniently relegated to the background by the sentimental gentlemen who inform us that woman stands on a pedestal carefully guarded by the loving care of man from contact with the rude realities of life. Miss Ramsay gives us the story of three sisters who find themselves in this condition, and lest anyone should be deterred from the perusal of their adventures by the fear of having their sensibilities unduly harrowed, we assure them that all meet with more or less success, and are left in comfort at the end. The career of the heroine herself closes with the "old old story," which will never become unfashionable so long as there are men and women in the world, even though all the aspirations of women for political and social justice were realised, whatever lugubrious and sentimental M.P.'s may say to the contrary. The author has introduced into her story ladies whom she depicts as the leaders of the women's suffrage movement, and has succeeded in drawing lifelike pictures, which present characteristics fairly, without verging on personal portraiture. We think the author might, with advantage, have extended the story to three volumes, by filling up the outline sketched; and there are a few scenes which we should have been content to see omitted; but, on the whole, we commend the book as one which will well repay perusal, and which cannot fail to do good by arousing thought on serious social questions.

PETITIONS.

WOMEN'S DISABILITIES BILL—AGAINST.

- § May 8. Lord Provost, Magistrates, and Town Council of ELGIN (*Mr. Grant Duff*) ... Seal. 1
- § — 11. Provost, Magistrates, and Council of LINTHGW, in public meeting assembled (*Mr. Ramsay*) ... Seal. 1

WOMEN'S DISABILITIES BILL.—IN FAVOUR.

- ¶ April 30. Inhabitants of BELFAST (*Mr. James Corry*) ... 100
- ¶ — EDINBURGH (*Mr. James Cowan*) ... 1,024
- ¶ — MARYLEBONE (*Mr. Forsyth*) ... 994
- ¶ — GREAT YARMOUTH (*Sir Edmund Lacon*) ... 10
- ¶ — — (*Sir Edmund Lacon*) ... 12
- ¶ — WESTBURY, Wilts (*Mr. Laverton*) ... 120
- ¶ — TROON (*Mr. Montgomerie*) ... 152
- § — STAFFORD, in public meeting assembled; John Kelsall, chairman (*Mr. Salt*) ... 1
- § — THURSO, in public meeting assembled; J. W. Galloway, chairman (*Sir John Sinclair*) ... 1
- ¶ — OLDHAM (*Mr. Serjeant Spinks*) ... 386
- ¶ — LEEDS (*Mr. Tennant*) ... 143
- ¶ — BENTHAM (*Sir Mathew Wilson*) ... 67
- ¶ — LEVEN (*Sir Robert Anstruther*) ... 53
- ¶ May 1. — All Saints' Ward, MANCHESTER (*Mr. Callender*) ... 308
- § — ABERYSTWTH, in public meeting assembled; P. Williams, chairman (*Mr. David Davies*) ... 1
- ¶ — THORNHILL, Dumfriesshire (*Mr. Johnstone*) ... 289
- ¶ — EDINBURGH (*Mr. M'Laren*) ... 1,004
- ¶ — LONGTON (*Dr. Lush*) ... 48
- ¶ — SHREWSBURY (*Mr. Robertson*) ... 116
- ¶ — CHAILEY and NEWICK (*Mr. Scott*) ... 119
- ¶ — LEEDS (*Mr. Tennant*) ... 333
- ¶ — DEBORAH BENNETT and others (*Mr. Tennant*) ... 239
- ¶ — Inhabitants of LEEDS (*Mr. Wheelhouse*) ... 324
- § — 4. Provost, Magistrates, and Town Council of DUNFERMLINE (*Mr. Campbell Bannerman*) ... Seal. 1
- ¶ — Female Inhabitants of SALFORD (*Mr. Charley*) ... 454
- ¶ — Inhabitants of ACTON, in the county of Middlesex (*Mr. Coope*) ... 88
- ¶ — — (*Mr. Coope*) ... 169
- ¶ — HARRIET PYNE and others (*Mr. Forsyth*) ... 28
- § — Vestry of SAINT PANCRAS (*Mr. Forsyth*) ... Seal. 1
- ¶ — Inhabitants of CHELSEA (*Mr. Wm. Gordon*) ... 1,201
- ¶ — MARY BUTLIN BROWN and others (*Mr. Ward Hunt*) ... 65
- § — Inhabitants of AYLESBURY, in public meeting assembled; Acton Tindall, chairman (*Mr. Lambert*) ... 1
- ¶ — DAVENTRY (*Sir Rainald Knightley*) ... 74
- § — STALYBRIDGE, in public meeting assembled; S. A. Steinthal, chairman (*Mr. Sidebottom*) ... 1
- ¶ — LEEDS (*Mr. Wheelhouse*) ... 179
- ¶ — 5. Inhabitants of All Saints' Ward, MANCHESTER (*Mr. Birley*) ... 422
- ¶ — WOOLWICH (*Mr. Boord*) ... 585
- ¶ — CHARLTON (*Mr. Boord*) ... 52
- § — WOOLWICH, in public meeting assembled; William Rowbotham, chairman (*Mr. Boord*) ... 1
- ¶ — LEEDS (*Mr. Carter*) ... 338
- ¶ — SALFORD (*Mr. Cavley*) ... 263
- ¶ — — (*Mr. Cavley*) ... 332
- ¶ — LASSWADE (*Earl of Dalkeith*) ... 86
- ¶ — HACKNEY (*Mr. Fawcett*) ... 1,362
- ¶ — GORTON, in the county of Lancaster (*Mr. Hardcastle*) ... 867

- ¶ May 5. Inhabitants of LEICESTER (*Mr. Alex. M'Arthur*) ... 75
- ¶ — BRISTOL (*Mr. Morley*) ... 1,016
- ¶ — — (*Mr. Morley*) ... 101
- § — 6. MARY DICK, Burntisland (*Sir R. Anstruther*) ... 1
- ¶ — Inhabitants of CIRENCESTER, in public meeting assembled; H. Ashbury, chairman (*Mr. Bathurst*) ... 1
- ¶ — MANCHESTER (*Sir Thomas Bazley*) ... 898
- § — BLACKBURN, in public meeting assembled; J. Morgan, chairman (*Mr. Briggs*) ... 1
- ¶ — MANCHESTER (*Mr. Callender*) ... 517
- ¶ — JAMES PRINCE and others (*Mr. Carter*) ... 77
- ¶ — LISETTE M. GREGORY and others (*Sir Thomas Chambers*) ... 14
- ¶ — Inhabitants of SALFORD (*Mr. Charley*) ... 274
- ¶ — RETFORD, in the county of Notts (*Viscount Galway*) ... 128
- ¶ — WINDSOR (*Mr. Richardson Gardner*) ... 312
- ¶ — — (*Mr. Richardson Gardner*) ... 334
- ¶ — Female Inhabitants of WOOLWICH (*Mr. William Ewart Gladstone*) ... 65
- ¶ — Inhabitants of PLUMSTEAD, in the county of Kent (*Mr. William Ewart Gladstone*) ... 1,240
- ¶ — Female Inhabitants of HAVERSTOCK HILL (*Lord George Hamilton*) ... 75
- ¶ — Inhabitants of CHEETHAM, Manchester (*Mr. Hardcastle*) ... 212
- ¶ — Female Inhabitants of PRESTON (*Mr. Hermon*) ... 1,031
- ¶ — Inhabitants of BRISTOL (*Mr. Kirkman Hodgson*) ... 284
- ¶ — SOUTHWARK (*Mr. Locke*) ... 1,413
- § — LARGS, in public meeting assembled; B. Kerr, chairman (*Mr. Montgomerie*) ... 1
- ¶ — LEICESTER (*Mr. Peter Taylor*) ... 124
- § — WOLVERHAMPTON, in public meeting assembled; T. G. Crippen, chairman (*Mr. Villiers*) ... 1
- § — WIGAN, in public meeting assembled; W. Melling, chairman ... 1
- ¶ — 7. — KENNINGTON (*Colonel Beresford*) ... 1,203
- ¶ — SOUTHWARK (*Colonel Beresford*) ... 678
- ¶ — HACKNEY (*Mr. John Holms*) ... 1,035
- ¶ — BETHNAL GREEN (*Mr. John Holms*) ... 1,047
- § — EKETER, in public meeting assembled; Thos. Ensor, chairman (*Mr. Johnson*) ... 1
- ¶ — EATON, in the county of Bucks (*Mr. Lambert*) ... 204
- ¶ — WALWORTH (*Sir James Lawrence*) ... 863
- ¶ — Magistrates and Council of ABERDEEN (*Mr. Leith*) ... Seal. 1
- ¶ — Inhabitants of LAMBETH (*Mr. William M'Arthur*) ... 685
- ¶ — ROSS, in the county of Hereford (*Mr. Pateshall*) ... 48
- ¶ — — (*Mr. Pateshall*) ... 17
- ¶ — — (*Mr. Pateshall*) ... 50
- ¶ — — (*Mr. Pateshall*) ... 49
- ¶ — — (*Mr. Pateshall*) ... 29
- ¶ — ROCHDALE (*Mr. Potter*) ... 1,188
- ¶ — — (*Mr. Potter*) ... 1,451
- ¶ — Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of DEWSBURY, in the county of York (*Mr. Serjeant Simon*) ... Seal. 2
- ¶ — Inhabitants of LEEDS (*Mr. Wheelhouse*) ... 73
- ¶ — — (*Mr. Wheelhouse*) ... 207
- ¶ — Saint Michael's Ward, BRISTOL ... 316
- § — 8. — DUNSTABLE, in public meeting assembled; T. Smallwood, chairman (*Mr. Bassett*) ... 1
- ¶ — MANCHESTER (*Mr. Birley*) ... 551
- ¶ — WINDERMERE (*Mr. Clifton*) ... 27
- ¶ — BOLTON-LE-MOORS (*Mr. John Cross*) ... 1,118
- ¶ — ROSLIN, Midlothian (*Earl of Dalkeith*) ... 80
- ¶ — CHEETHAM, Manchester (*Mr. Alg. Egerton*) ... 516
- ¶ — CAMDEN TOWN (*Mr. Forsyth*) ... 1,673
- § — CRICKLADE, in public meeting assembled; H. Austin, Chairman (*Sir Dnl. Gooch*) ... 1
- ¶ — GORTON, in the county of Lancaster (*Mr. Hardcastle*) ... 604
- § — Corporation of BRIDGWATER (*Capt. Hood*) ... Seal. 1
- § — YORK, in public meeting assembled; John Marsh, chairman (*Mr. Leeman*) ... 1

SUMMARY OF PETITIONS PRESENTED UP TO JUNE 16th, 1874.

	No. of Petitions signed Officially or under Seal.	Total No. of Petitions.	Total No. of Signatures.
Women's Disabilities Bill—In favour	186	1,270	389,412
„ „ „ „ Against	3	3	3

MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS RECEIVED DURING JUNE, 1874.

	£	s.	d.
Lady Anna Gore Langton	21	0	0
Mr. and Mrs. W. Thorold Wood	10	0	0
Mrs. Todd (Chester)	10	0	0
Miss E. A. Todd	5	0	0
Miss L. Todd	5	0	0
H. S.	5	0	0
Mr. H. Lightbown	3	3	0
The Dowager Countess Buchan	2	0	0
Mr. Philip Williams	1	1	0
Mr. H. C. Stephens	1	1	0
Mrs. M. P. Townsend	1	1	0
Mrs. Annie Moorhouse	1	1	0
Mr. J. B. Mc.Kerrow	1	1	0
Mrs. Ord	1	0	0
Mr. R. Bedlington	1	0	0
Miss E. Kellett	1	0	0
Mr. W. Melling	1	0	0
Mrs. Mary Dick	1	0	0
Mr. J. O. Milne	1	0	0
Miss L. A. Bowling	1	0	0
Miss Knott	1	0	0
Miss D. Thomson	1	0	0
A Lady's Derby Winnings	1	0	0
Mrs. Tewson	1	0	0
Mr. H. Nicol	0	10	6
Mr. G. B. Longstaff	0	10	6
Mrs. W. B. Smith (Birmingham)	0	10	6
Mrs. G. Twigg	0	10	6
E. D. R. Elvetham	0	10	6
Mrs. Elizabeth R. Scott (London)	0	10	0
Mrs. Melling	0	10	0
Mrs. Kenderdine	0	10	0
Mr. Lewis Appleton	0	10	0
"A Friend" per Miss Jolly	0	10	0
Clair J. Grece, LL.D.	0	10	0
Mrs. Moore	0	10	0
Misses F. and H. Smith	0	10	0
Mrs. G. Senior	0	7	6
Rev. H. Cholmeley	0	5	6
Miss F. A. Trevor	0	5	0
Miss H. M. Trevor	0	5	0
Mr. J. Paterson	0	5	0
Mr. J. Briant	0	5	0
Mrs. Scott (Cheltenham)	0	5	0
Miss M. E. Cheetham	0	5	0
Miss Jane Gouch	0	5	0
Mrs. M. Taylor	0	5	0
Dr. John Latham	0	5	0
Mrs. Mary Jones	0	5	0
Mr. Thomas Cooper	0	5	0
Mr. J. G. Blumer	0	5	0
Mr. J. Fogg	0	5	0
Mrs. Massey	0	5	0
The Misses Mackie	0	5	0
Mrs. Fuller	0	5	0
Miss Frances Hickey	0	5	0
Mr. John H. Smith	0	5	0
Mr. J. Grundy	0	5	0
Mr. A. Porter	0	5	0
Mr. M. Ridgway	0	5	0
Mr. R. Hope	0	5	0
Mr. John Glover	0	3	0
Mrs. J. Slatter	0	2	6
Mrs. W. Thomas	0	2	6
Mrs. Hetherington	0	2	6
Mr. C. Whitwell	0	2	6
Mr. S. G. R. Trevor	0	2	0
"A Friend," Wigan	0	2	0
"A Lady"	0	1	0

£91 1 6

S. ALFRED STEINTHAL, Treasurer.
Cheques and Post Office Orders should be made payable to the Treasurer, Rev. S. ALFRED STEINTHAL, and may be sent either direct to him at 107, Upper Brook-street; or to the Secretary, Miss BECKER, 28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.—The ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING will be held in the Westminster Palace Hotel, on Monday, July 6th, 1874, to appoint the Executive Committee, to receive the Report and Financial Statement, and transact any other business that may arise. Chair to be taken at Three o'clock, by WILLIAM FORSYTH, Esq., Q.C., M.P. The Right Hon. J. STANSFELD, M.P., JACOB BRIGHT, Esq., Miss FRANCES POWER COBBE, Miss TOD, Miss STURGE, Mrs. FAWCETT, and other ladies and gentlemen are expected to take part in the proceedings. The attendance of friends is invited.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

Contributions to the funds of the Central Committee of the National Society for Women's Suffrage, 294, Regent Street, London, W., from May 19th, to June 23rd, 1874.

	£	s.	d.
Thos. Thomason, Esq.	20	0	0
Mrs. Chas. Holland	10	0	0
Mrs. Pennington	10	0	0
Mr. Sewell	1	0	0
Miss Isabella Jackson	0	5	0
Mrs. Wade	0	3	0
Mrs. Edwd. Welsh	0	2	6
Miss Wade	0	2	0
Mr. Warr	0	1	0
Mrs. H. Wedgwood	1	1	0
Mrs. Sterling	1	1	0
Rev. A. G. L'Estrange	1	0	0
Mrs. Benham	0	10	0
Mrs. Donkin	0	10	0
Mrs. H. Roberts	0	10	0
Miss Scott	0	10	0
Mrs. Carvell Williams	0	10	0
Mrs. Addison	0	5	0
Miss Anderson	0	5	0
Mrs. Bolton	0	5	0
Mrs. Paterson	0	5	0
Miss Donkin	0	5	0
Miss Kelly	0	5	0

£48 15 6

ALFRED W. BENNETT, Treasurer.

The Offices of the Central Committee have been removed from Berners Street, to the more central situation of 294, Regent Street (Langham Place).

YORKSHIRE SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS RECEIVED IN APRIL AND MAY, 1874.

	£	s.	d.
M. M. Warburgh, Esq.	2	2	0
Darnton Lupton, Esq.	1	1	0
Mrs. Ford	1	0	0
Mr. John Bevan	0	5	0
Miss Pearson	0	5	0
Miss Latchmore	0	2	6
Mr. Edw. Pulleyn	0	2	6

£1 18 0

Mrs. SCATCHERD, Secretary.
Mrs. EDWARD WALKER, Treasurer.

Central Office: 1, Victoria Chambers, South Parade, Leeds.

SUBSCRIPTIONS RECEIVED BY THE YORK BRANCH.

	£	s.	d.
Mrs. H. Richardson	1	1	0
A Friend	1	1	0
Misses Wilkinson	1	0	0
Mrs. Edward Smithson	0	16	0
Mrs. Fielden Thorp	0	10	0
Mrs. Alfred Spence	0	10	0
Mr. Rowntree	0	10	0
Rev. John Hunter	0	10	0
Mrs. Smith	0	2	6

£6 0 6