

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

VOL. VII.—No. 73. PUBLISHED MONTHLY.
REGISTERED FOR TRANSMISSION ABROAD.

MARCH 1, 1876.

PRICE ONE PENNY.
BY POST THREE HALFPENCE.

THE second reading of the Women's Disabilities Bill is fixed for Wednesday, April 26th, which is the day after the Easter holidays corresponding to the date of last year. Members who give notice of Bills have to submit to the blind chance of the ballot for the order in which they are called up to fix the day for the second reading, and Mr. FORSYTH has been more fortunate than many others in obtaining a free Wednesday at a comparatively early period of the session. Many important Bills have been withdrawn, because their authors drew so bad a number that all such days were appropriated before their turn came to be called to the Speaker's table, and our friends are to be congratulated on the better fortune that has fallen to the lot of Mr. FORSYTH. Petitioning should proceed with vigour, and all friends who are preparing them should take care to send them up in good time before Easter.

Two years ago, at the general election, the supporters of the Women's Disabilities Removal Bill had to suffer the loss of the Parliamentary services of the leader who had introduced the measure in the House of Commons, and conducted it through four successive sessions with a constantly increasing amount of support. The regret they felt was, however, cheered by the confident hope that the loss was but temporary, and the belief that so earnest, so thorough, and so able a politician as Mr. JACOB BRIGHT could not long remain excluded from Parliament. We have now the unspeakable satisfaction of recording the fruition of these hopes by the result of the election for Manchester on the 17th of February. Mr. JACOB BRIGHT was returned by 22,770 votes against 20,985 polled for his opponent, Mr. POWELL, a majority of 1,785. We may be pardoned for regarding the triumph of Mr. JACOB BRIGHT as a precursor of the success of the measure with which his name is inseparably connected; and we point with pride to the circumstance that the foremost champion of the principle of the extension of the franchise to women occupies the proud position of premier member of the House of Commons, according to the number of recorded votes. Mr. JACOB BRIGHT is sent to Parliament by a greater number of votes than have ever been re-

corded for any other member. Manchester is the largest constituency in the three kingdoms except Liverpool, and the votes polled for the senior member for Liverpool, Lord SANDON, at the general election, were fewer by thousands than those which have now been given for Mr. JACOB BRIGHT.

Other elections during the past month also afford cause for congratulation. The return of Mr. PETER RYLANDS for Burnley not only restores an able and useful member to the House of Commons, but replaces an opponent by a supporter of our Bill. Mr. BLAKE, who has just been elected for Leominster, expressed himself during his canvass as warmly in favour of the measure. The Manchester election does not alter the voting power numerically, the late member, Mr. CALLENDER, whose unexpected decease caused unfeigned regret throughout the city, having voted for Mr. FORSYTH's Bill; but at Burnley and Leominster, there is a gain of one supporter at each place, which is equivalent to four votes in the division.

When the promoters of the Bill were deprived of the services of its original champion, they had another source of consolation besides the hope of his return, in the fact that the Bill did not remain long without a sponsor. It was a matter of sincere congratulation that they were able to enlist the services of a member of the eminence and ability of Mr. FORSYTH for the charge of the measure, and their confidence has been justified by the result. The Bill appears to have lost no ground through the change in the leader, a result partly owing to the intrinsic justice of the case, and the force of the argument in its favour; partly to the support which had been won through the influence of Mr. BRIGHT being retained for the measure in its new hands; and last, but not least, to the new aspect which was given to the measure by its transfer to Conservative leadership, and by the ability and earnestness with which it was advocated by Mr. FORSYTH. The new Parliament appeared to be more favourable to the principle than its predecessor, and a large majority of the new members who took part in the division recorded their votes in favour of the Bill. The hostile majority was reduced from 67 in the last to 35 in the present House of Commons,

and the strength of the opposition was found to lie in the members who formed the remnant of the former Parliament. Mr. FORSYTH was followed into the lobby, not only by a much larger number and proportion of Conservative members than had supported the measure on any previous occasion, but by an actual majority of the Liberal members present, a result which had not been achieved by Mr. JACOB BRIGHT since the first introduction of the measure. In 1870 the Liberal vote was more than two to one against the Bill, the numbers being 137 to 60. Successive divisions modified these figures, until the last year of the old Parliament, when the Liberal vote was 109 for and 116 against. Last year the Liberals voted 89 for to 79 against, notwithstanding the fact that the Bill was in Conservative hands.

We trust that Mr. FORSYTH will continue to receive increased support for the Bill from his own side of the House, while the return of Mr. JACOB BRIGHT, and the powerful advocacy that may be expected from him, would seem to promise a considerable accession of strength from the Liberal party. The Bill has grown in strength and favour under the separate efforts of Mr. JACOB BRIGHT and Mr. FORSYTH, and what may we not expect from the combined efforts of two such champions? The prospect of the measure in such hands offers the greatest encouragement and the strongest incentive to the friends of the Bill to exert themselves to the uttermost, and give worthy support to their leaders; and if they make the best of the time allotted them we cannot doubt that the twenty-sixth of April will be marked by a substantial triumph for our cause.

A NOTEWORTHY incident of the Manchester election is thus recorded by a local paper as "showing that even under the present suffrage women cannot always be excluded from voting at Parliamentary elections." A lady householder voted in Oxford Ward. Her name, CHRISTIAN DONALD, was unmistakably on the register. She claimed her privilege, and as her name appeared on the burgess roll the returning officer could not refuse her a ballot paper. She made no secret of the fact that she used it on behalf of the champion of the equalisation of the municipal and Parliamentary franchise.

This is not the first occasion on which Mr. JACOB BRIGHT has received similar support. At the election in 1867, when he was first returned to Parliament, before the last Reform Act, LILY MAXWELL, whose name was on the register, recorded her vote in his favour. This was the

first occasion in which a woman had voted since the Reform Act of 1832, and the circumstance excited a great amount of public attention, not only in this country, but on the Continent of Europe and in America. The *Times* had a leading article on the event, and the fame of LILY MAXWELL spread far and wide. The circumstance was valuable as proving that, whatever might be the legal incapacity, there was neither physical, mental, nor moral incapacity to hinder a woman from exercising the privilege of the franchise in a rational and intelligent manner, and that, even before the passing of the Ballot Act, she might enter a polling booth and record a vote without the smallest practical inconvenience or annoyance or any unpleasant consequences.

On the first election after the Reform Act, numbers of women were on the register of voters in many places, and of these a great proportion recorded their votes. This was before the enfranchising clause in the municipal franchise Act had made all the world familiar with the practice of women voting. As the Parliamentary registers were weeded of the names of the women who had been originally placed thereon by the authorities who believed that the terms of Mr. DISRAELI'S Reform Act included women householders, voting by women has been rare; and only in exceptional instances, caused by confusion of names, can a woman now appear at a Parliamentary election. It is gratifying to note that in such cases women come to avail themselves of the privilege accidentally conferred upon them, and thus give a practical refutation of the assertion that women do not desire the franchise, by proving that they do vote when they get a chance.

Mr. WALTER BAGEHOT, in a paper in the *Fortnightly Review*, makes the following observations on the recent origin of the idea that slavery is not an essential condition of human affairs. "We must remember that our modern notion that slavery is an exceptional institution is itself an exceptional idea, it is the product of recent times and recent philosophies. No ancient philosopher, no primitive community would have comprehended what we meant by it. That human beings are divided into strong and weak, higher and lower, or what is thought to be such, and that the weak and inferior ought to be made to serve the higher and better, whether they would wish to do so or not, are settled axioms of early thought. Whatever might be the origin, and whatever might be the fate of other institutions, the ancient world did not doubt that slavery existed 'by the law of nature,' and would last as long as men."

The condition of mind in which some members of Parliament appear to be with respect to the political rights of women, presents a curious parallel to that of the ancient world with regard to the civil rights of slaves. That mankind is divided into a stronger and weaker sex, and that the weak and inferior ought to be made to serve, and be politically subject to the stronger and higher, is with them a settled axiom of thought. Whatever may be the fate of other institutions, they do not doubt that the political subjection of women exists "by the law of nature," and will last as long as men. The claim of women to political equality with men has been scouted in the House of Commons as one which "set aside the immemorial usage of mankind," as doubtless was the fate of the first claim made on behalf of slaves to civil equality with their masters. But the plea of immemorial usage could not bar the claims of justice in the latter case, and it will be equally futile in the former. The notion of man's property in man, which has existed ever since man came to have a notion of property, is now finally obsolete in this country, and we cannot doubt that the notion of man's property in woman will in due time follow it to the limbo of forgotten things.

A CASE lately tried before the Queen's Bench division of the High Court of Justice, is instructive as to the power of husbands over their wives allowed by the common law of England. The question was whether after a divorce, one of the parties can maintain an action against the other for assault or other personal injury during the marriage. The plaintiff, SARAH PHILLIPS, complained that the defendant beat and ill-treated her, whereby she was permanently injured. The defendant pleaded among other things, that at the time of the assault the plaintiff was his lawful wife. Mr. C. RUSSELL, Q.C., argued for the defendant that the action was not maintainable, for by the common law the husband might assault his wife, for he might use lawful correction, for which he cited Blackstone's Commentary, vol. i., ch. 15. In the course of the pleadings Mr. Justice LUSH said that supposing during the marriage the husband had maimed the wife, or so injured her as to prevent her from earning a livelihood, could not the Judge, under the Divorce Act, take that into consideration? Mr. BROWN, replying for the plaintiff, said, that no doubt he could, as to allowance for her future support, but not as to compensation for the past, and unless such an action were maintainable there would be no remedy for the most atrocious injuries inflicted by the husband during marriage. The court, however, in the

course of the reply, interrupted the defendant's counsel and gave judgment in his favour. Mr. Justice BLACKBURN said the rule of law was that husband and wife were one person, which prevented a cause of action arising between them. Mr. Justice LUSH concurred. The question, he said, was of great importance, for many divorces proceeded on the ground of cruelty coupled with adultery. The effect of the decision would be that in every case of this class the wife could maintain no action against her late husband for injuries caused by his cruelty. It was the first case of the kind, and the consequences of allowing such actions must be considered. It was a maxim of law that husband and wife were one person. Mr. Justice FIELD also concurred, admitting that he had not arrived at that conclusion without doubt, but he arrived at it without reluctance, as he thought the action contrary to a fundamental principle of the Common Law, and that to allow such actions would be to produce most mischievous consequences.

We suppose that the mischievous consequences feared by the learned justices must be mischievous to husbands who ill treat their wives to the point of legal cruelty. We are unable to conceive the possibility of mischief to others from allowing such actions to maimed wives. Some slight additional safeguard from personal violence would be afforded to wives if, when the violence had been sufficient to enable her to obtain a divorce, she could maintain an action for compensation for the injuries caused by such violence, but this safeguard it seems our laws do not afford.

In the House of Commons on February 18th, Colonel EGERTON LEIGH asked the HOME SECRETARY whether the Government intended to take any steps to prevent aggravated assaults upon women. Mr. CROSS replied that he was waiting for further reports from the judges. We commend to the consideration of members of Parliament the sentiment of a man who was convicted a short time ago of an assault on his wife, and who, on receiving sentence, said "What is the use of punishing me for beating my wife? Make her my equal, and I'll treat her as such."

THE need for an amendment of the law relating to the property of married women is constantly receiving fresh illustration. Mrs. ASHFORD, in a recent speech at Evesham, said that she knew a case where a lady who had an income of £300 married a young professional man of high character and first-rate prospects. She had too much faith in her lover to ask that the property should

be settled upon her, and he, knowing that marriage made it all his, said he would immediately after marriage make a will leaving her everything. With this she was perfectly satisfied; but in the first few months of their happiness the subject was not renewed, and before the year was out the husband was seized with illness—brain fever set in, then no will could be made, and he died. She is now a widow with £100 a year, the other two-thirds of her property going to her husband's next of kin.

It is sometimes alleged that a marriage settlement would protect a woman against the evil of the existing law, but the futility of the protection supposed to be afforded when the husband proves unworthy, that is, under precisely those circumstances in which the wife most needs protection, is illustrated by a case sent us by a correspondent from Ireland. A lady by birth and education has just taken up the occupation of sick nursing as a means of livelihood, under the following circumstances. She is the wife of a doctor, a clever man, who has gradually become a great drunkard, and has now deserted her. She has procured situations for her two sons in business, and a benevolent lady, the head of a large high school for girls, is educating her eldest girl without charge; but the child has been so crushed by sorrow that she will never be able to learn enough to teach. There are several younger children, and their mother, without any training, but having some natural taste and experience, has begun to go out as a sick nurse. *All the while* the income of a comfortable sum, settled upon her by her father, is drawn quarterly by her husband and spent upon himself. A lawyer advised her to go to the workhouse and the Guardians would prosecute the husband; but the Chairman of the Board told her that besides the disgrace of it to her and her children, if her husband chose to come and say that he would support her they could do nothing further, and she would be compelled to live with him, which she dreads on account of the evil example to her boys.

We believe that when property is settled to the separate use of the wife the interest becomes in law the property of the husband the moment it comes into her hand; and thus it may happen that a wife with a handsome marriage settlement may be reduced to enter the workhouse to secure the means of subsistence, and the settlement be no provision for her present needs.

ANOTHER striking instance of the negation of a mother's rights has just been given by the Irish Law Courts. A girl of

nine years of age, whose father is dead, has been torn from the care of her mother, not because it was pretended that the father had made a will to that effect, but simply on the ground that the mother was a Catholic, and the father had been a Protestant while he was alive. In the Irish Court of Chancery, on February 17th, Mr. FOOT, J.P., county Cork, presented a petition praying that his granddaughter, a child nine years of age, might be transferred from the care of her mother, a Roman Catholic, and placed under the care of her guardians, two aunts, who are Protestants, with a view to her being brought up in the Protestant religion. It appeared that the father, who is dead, was a Protestant, and that the child had originally been baptised a Roman Catholic. The Court granted the prayer of the petition.

It is hard enough that a living father by his mere will, during his life and after his death, can deprive the mother of her child and his children of a mother's care; but the case becomes absolutely monstrous in such cases as the above, when the father has died without exercising this power. The difference of religion betwixt himself and his wife must have been known to him, and he had ample power of providing against it if he had thought fit on that account to separate mother and child. Yet it seems that in the absence of an expressed desire of the father, his relations can, after his death, come before the law courts, and forcibly take away a girl of tender years from her mother, to be brought up in a faith contrary to that mother's conscience. Religious liberty is a mockery for women, if mothers and daughters may not have communion in their own faith in their widowed and fatherless home—in that faith which the head of that home refused to disturb during his life. No words of ours can describe this wrong so forcibly as those which were employed by Vice-Chancellor WICKENS, in giving judgment in the Lancaster Chancery Court on a somewhat similar case, in which the religion of the parties was reversed, but the father had given no directions as to the religion in which his child should be educated. His Honour characterised the decision he was compelled to give in the following terms: "To direct that the ward should be brought up in the Roman Catholic faith will be to create a barrier between a widowed mother and her only child; to annul the mother's influence over her daughter on the most important of all the subjects on which it can be exercised, with the almost inevitable effect of weakening it on all others; to introduce a disturbing element into a union which ought to be as close, as warm, and as absolute as any known to man; and, lastly,

to inflict the most severe pain on both mother and child. But it is clear that no argument which would recognise any right in the widowed mother to bring up her child in a religion different from that of the father can be allowed to weigh with me at all. According to the law of this court, the mother has no such right. The duty of the widowed mother is in general to bring up the child according to the faith which the father professed, even though she utterly disapproves it, and feels that to do so will cloud the relation between them."

THE *Sydney Morning Herald* contains an interesting account of the expedition of the Chevert, communicated by Mr. WILLIAM MACLEARY, from which we extract the following comparison: "In the village of Mohatta, at the mouth of the Katow River, the houses are built close to the sea, and are everywhere surrounded by filth, mud, and stench. The women are not allowed to be seen by strangers; they are hewers of wood and drawers of water. All the work has to be done by them, the duties of the men being confined to hunting, fishing, and fighting. Beyond the ranges, at a distance of ten miles from the coast, the difference in the character of the population is very marked. *The women seem to rule*; and, unlike the black people, they are very free in their intercourse with strangers. Their villages and houses are clean, and generally on sloping ground. They have a house in every village for the reception of guests. They seem to live in large communities in the most amicable way, without law, police, magistrates, or judges. They pay considerable attention to cookery, and they manufacture pottery and cloths and nets of excellent quality from various fibres." Whether this higher civilisation is the cause or the effect of the higher consideration given to women in the latter case may be doubtful; but the experience of ages proves that the condition of women is the surest criterion of the progress of a nation. The subjection and seclusion of women are concomitants of degradation; and the nearer women are raised to equality with men, and the more they are admitted to share in the moral, intellectual, and political life of a community, the greater the advance of that community in all that separates civilisation from the reign of brute force and barbarism.

THE petitions presented up to February 18th for the Women's Disabilities Removal Bill are 83, with 51,756 signatures. They are far in excess of the number presented for any other object, the next highest number being 11,089 against the Burials Bill, and we trust that

numerical supremacy may be maintained. The text of the petitions will be found in our advertising sheet, along with directions how to proceed.

The list of Bills for the present session is published, and of these only two are for the improvement of the law relating to women. They are Mr. FORSYTH'S Franchise Bill, and a Bill introduced by Mr. COWPER TEMPLE to enable women who have obtained medical degrees at certain foreign Universities to have those degrees registered in this country as a legal qualification for practice. The second reading of Mr. COWPER TEMPLE'S Bill is fixed for Wednesday, July 5th. As all available days for the introduction of Bills by private members are now occupied, it will not be possible to have any other measures for the benefit of women brought forward this session.

We would point out to those who are promoting efforts for the amendment of the law in various matters relating to women, that while petitions are of extreme value and of absolute necessity in supporting a Bill actually before Parliament, they are of little or no practical use in favour of any proposal which is not the subject of Parliamentary discussion. All measures affecting women will receive an enormous impetus when women householders are admitted to the franchise; we therefore exhort, not only those who are especially engaged in working for Mr. FORSYTH'S Bill, but also those who are more immediately interested in other reforms, to devote their strength this session to petitioning for the Franchise Bill. This is one of the only two measures as to which there is any possibility of influencing legislation this year; and the gain of the suffrage will open the way to amending the law on all those points on which it is, as Mr. GLADSTONE says—"too much against women, and too much in favour of men."

PARLIAMENTARY INTELLIGENCE.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, February, 1876.

The Bill to Remove the Electoral Disabilities of Women was ordered to be brought in by Mr. Forsyth, Sir R. Anstruther, Rt. Hon. Russell Gurney, and Rt. Hon. James Stansfeld; presented, and read the first time, February 9th; to be read a second time upon *Wednesday, 26th April*, and to be printed. [Bill 20.]

THE FOLLOWING IS THE TEXT OF THE BILL:—

Be it enacted by the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:—

1. That in all Acts relating to the qualification and registration of voters or persons entitled or claiming to be registered and to vote in the election of Members of Parliament, wherever words occur which import the masculine gender, the same shall be held to include females for all purposes connected with and having reference to the right to be registered as voters, and to vote in such election, any law or usage to the contrary notwithstanding.

PUBLIC MEETINGS.

YORK.

SPEECH OF LORD HOUGHTON.

On January 31st a very numerous meeting took place in the Festival Concert Room at York, under the presidency of Lord Houghton. Miss Becker and Miss Beedy attended as a deputation from the National Society for furthering the object in view, and there were also present on the platform—Sir James Meek, the Rev. F. Lawrence, Mr. E. Swaine, the Rev. John Hunter, Mr. Alfred Spence, Mr. W. Empson, Mr. H. Richardson, the Rev. Mr. Wellbeloved, Mr. T. Monkhouse, Miss Swaine, Miss Barnes, Misses Adams, Mrs. James, &c.

Lord HOUGHTON, who was received with cheers, said:—It has been the glory—it is the comfort of this country, that the Legislature takes as it were into its confidence, as is required, the assent of the English people. That being so, our progress in the extension of the suffrage has not been founded on any paper charter or upon any sudden history or revolution, but it has grown up in a gradual and just way, according to the requirements of the people. And thus it is that we find ourselves now in the position of what is commonly called household suffrage. That is to say, that every man possessing a certain tenure of fixed estate, almost however small, and any other position which gives him a clear fixed position of certain citizenship, has a right to vote for members of Parliament, and thus to assent to the principle of his own taxation. Holding however little property, he is an assenting party to the principle that taxes that property. This is a position which recommends itself to the common sense of all Englishmen. But it seems that there are classes—I won't say classes—but that there are masses of the community which may possess this property, which may hold it distinctly as their own, and yet, from the circumstance of their being women instead of men, have not the right to vote for that property; and, so far as that goes, that property is taxed without their assent or consent. I dare say some of you have read in history long ago—and the analogy comes before me very strongly, because I have just come from that great country of America—that the American people, the American nation, the whole of that continent might at this present moment have been part of England had it not been for the unwise, the insane attempt of the Government at that time to try to force upon them taxation without representation. (Hear, hear, and applause.) The Americans said, "We will not have this: we will not pay money for purposes of which we know nothing, at the will of a legislature, which we have not contributed to elect; therefore we will separate from you, and we will be an independent people." So, one hundred years ago, this happened. Now, gentlemen, this is exactly the position at present of the women of England. They are in the position of America at that time. You are asking them, these women—some of them proprietors, some of them wealthy, some of them wealthier than any of you—you are asking them to be content with a state of things in which they are asked to be taxed for their property, without having in any degree the right of representation. It is a very curious thing to see historically how that same feeling, which at that time caused that tremendous disruption between England and her greatest colony, now rises, with a sense of injustice, amongst the women of this country. (Applause.) Therefore, you see, ladies and gentlemen, that this is a practical question, and a very close practical question. I don't mean to say, you know, that the issue will be the same. (Hear, hear.) I don't pretend to say that if you refuse to agree with this petition—I don't

say that if Parliament refuses to entertain this proposition, that the issue will be the same, namely, that all the women will go off into a separate unity. (Laughter and applause.) We can't contemplate anything so dreadful. But besides the humour of the thing—besides what might be almost the comic side of the thing, you nevertheless will see the real meaning that lies at the bottom of this question, that the women of England holding property do feel it to be a burning injustice that they have no share or part whatever in the representation of this country. (Hear, hear.) I wish you to understand the petition which will lie for signature this evening proposes nothing fanatical, foolish, or revolutionary, but simply follows out the great lines of English liberty and English principle. (Applause.) The question, no doubt, has larger bearing—no doubt it certainly will have some gradual effect upon the relation of the sexes, and upon the character of the women of this country. I don't know whether I should have taken much interest in it as a question of abstract right if I had not felt that there were collateral advantages, of which I am certainly not unconscious, and of which I don't believe you will be. No doubt this certain portion of the women of this country, coming more formally and distinctly into political life, will, in a certain, nevertheless, in no large degree, increase the interest of women in politics generally—(hear hear)—and I, for my part, believe that that interest is a good thing both for politics themselves and for the women themselves. If you believe that it would be very injurious for either the society we live in, or for the character of the women themselves, you might say, "We must submit to this injustice, because we are not going to do this larger injury." I know myself, in the rank of life in which I have happened to live, knowing the advantage that has been given to politics by the presence of distinguished, powerful, and intelligent ladies—I know how they have refined the world of politics, how they have kept back the baser interests and the less honourable positions, and have kept men true to a just cause, and caused them to remain faithful to their party and to their friends against the inducements either of position or political advantages. I know that that feeling is strong in the heart of woman; and I believe that so far as that goes it is generally held by society that a woman will rather keep her friends right than induce them to go wrong in politics. (Hear, hear.) By right or wrong I do not mean this or that politics, but I think they will do the best they can to keep the man true and honest according to his belief. (Applause.) Therefore, I think I am not wrong in giving one of the collateral advantages of this movement, that it has indicated and designed how the political advancement of the women of England may tend to their intellectual development and the importance of their personal position. (Applause.) Remark you, since this question has been agitated, that other questions with regard to the position of women in England have advanced. See how much has been done for their education. See how the colleges for the intellectual improvement of women have been growing throughout this country. See within the last week an announcement has been made that the University of London intends to move for a charter for the admission of women to their full degree. (Applause.) That is part of this same movement and this same feeling. See, too, how much stronger the feeling is growing in this country of the duty of women to support themselves by honest industry, and not to remain the chance waifs and strays of society, dependent upon any waters of fortune on which they may be carried. By expressing your interest in this meeting and its effects, you will do two things. You will remedy as far as you can a great national injustice, a breach in the constitution of this country, for so I consider it in the inequality of men and

women in regard to property. You will go further than that. You will, by saying this equality should exist, say it ought to exist elsewhere; it ought to exist in trade, in commerce, and in any matter in which a woman has a fair chance of earning her livelihood, in keeping her position, and developing the mind that God has given her. Therefore, you have no small or unimportant sympathy here to consider—a large one, one worthy the consideration of the British people, and one which I commend to you this evening. (Applause.) The meeting was afterwards addressed by Miss Beedy, Sir James Meek, Miss Stuart, Miss Becker, the Rev. J. Lawrence, and the Rev. J. Hunter, and resolutions in support of the objects of the society were carried almost unanimously. Votes of thanks concluded the proceedings.

EVESHAM.

A very important public meeting to discuss the question of extending the Parliamentary suffrage to women householders was held in the Town Hall, Evesham, on January 19th. The hall was crowded with an influential audience. The Rev. Matthew Wood, M.A., formerly vicar of Evesham, presided. The chairman, in opening the proceedings, after some preliminary remarks, said he could not see any great difficulty in women forming an opinion and recording a vote. Women had done greater things than this; they had been great in science, in art, and in literature; and they had been great in those things that man considered to especially belong to himself, in matters of bravery and hardihood. He need not do more than mention the name of Joan of Arc, the maid of Orleans, who did more than man could do, for she inspired spirit into dispirited soldiers, and was the direct means of freeing France from her enemies. Then they might think of the defence of Leatham House by the Countess of Derby, and later still the exploits of Grace Darling. In all that was held to be manly, woman had achieved greatness; and as to voting there was no physical disability to prevent women from thinking about and recording a vote. The chairman then discussed the distinction between inability and disability; showing that it was disability and not inability to vote under which women laboured, for they were prevented from doing something that they could do. It was to discuss whether they should remove this disability that they had met there that night. He then proceeded to discuss various points in an able speech, after which the first resolution was moved by Mr. J. Colston, and seconded by the Vicar of Evesham, who said he had much pleasure in doing so, for he had for a long time taken a great interest in the movement. He had not entered minutely into the arguments for and against the proposal, because he had been from the first convinced of the simple justice of the case. The resolution was supported by Mrs. Ashford and Miss Beedy, and carried unanimously. Mr. Councillor Master moved, and Mr. A. H. Wright seconded a resolution adopting petitions and memorials, which was carried; and, after the usual votes of thanks, the meeting dispersed. The proceedings throughout were of the most orderly character, the greatest attention was paid to all the speakers, and there was a general concurrence of opinion that this was one of the best conducted and most important public meetings held in the town for many years past. *Abridged from the Evesham Journal.*

The following letter has been received since the meeting from Col. James Bourne, M.P.:

Heathfield, Liverpool, Jan. 24th, 1876.

My dear Mr. Wood,—Will you please inform those who are interested, that I shall have great pleasure in presenting the petition entrusted to me in favour of Female Suffrage. I have always voted for that measure, and hope to do so again whenever it is brought forward.—With kind regards, believe me, yours very truly,

JAMES BOURNE.

The Rev. M. Wood, the Lodge, Evesham.

BRISTOL.

The annual meeting of the subscribers and friends of the Bristol and West of England branch of the National Society for Women's Suffrage was held February 17th, at the offices of the society, 53, Park-street, under the presidency of Mrs. Chas. Thomas.—Miss L. Ashworth read the annual report of the society.—Mr. Alan Greenwell, M.A., read the statement of accounts, which showed a small balance in hand.—Miss Estlin moved that the meeting adopt the report and financial statement just read, and direct that they be circulated.—This was seconded by Mr. Bartlett, and carried.—Mrs. Walker moved the adoption of names of the executive committee for the ensuing year, which were read.—The resolution was seconded by the Rev. W. Hargreaves, who said there could be no doubt as to the direction in which public opinion was now moving.—The resolution was adopted.—Miss Priestman read the rules of the society, and moved that they be accepted. She spoke of the return of Mr. Rylands and Mr. Blake this week as being two more in the House who would support the object of their society, and said they looked for something pleasant to-morrow by the return of Mr. Jacob Bright.—The rules were accepted, after their adoption had been seconded by the Rev. U. R. Thomas.—Dr. Mary Walker-Dunbar moved, and Mr. J. W. Willis seconded, a vote of thanks to Mrs. Thomas for presiding, and the meeting terminated.

SCOTLAND.

EDINBURGH.

On February 16th, the annual meeting of the Edinburgh National Society for Women's Suffrage was held in the Literary Institute. There was a good attendance. Amongst others present were—Professor Masson, Professor Hodgson, Mr. Macfie (of Dreghorn), Councillor Wellstood, Councillor Durham, ex-Bailie Lewis, the Rev. Mr. Seton, ex-Councillor Robertson, Mr. Duncan McLaren, jun., Mrs. Duncan McLaren, Miss Becker (Manchester), Miss Beedy, Miss Wigham, Mrs. Wellstood, Miss Stevenson, Mrs. Macqueen, Miss Craig, Miss Caldwell, Mrs. and Miss Hope (of Bordlands), Mrs. Nichol, Mrs. Lucas, Mrs. Hodgson, Mrs. Richardson, and Miss E. Kirkland. On the motion of Councillor Durham, Professor Masson was called to the chair. The Chairman, who was received with applause, after some observations on the present state of the question, said we know that there is a very definite opposition, and we know on what that opposition has come to found itself—on a certain notion of women as to their possibilities and powers—a very extraordinary notion expressed again and again in various forms, sometimes in the form of great adoration, and sometimes in the form of ridicule and contempt. In that opinion there is a curious contrariety between theory and fact. The theory is that all women are supported and maintained by men, and that they have to stand aside and occupy a peculiar position by themselves and be protected and worshipped. The fact is, that between three and four millions of women, in spite of all this, are at present working for their daily bread in this country—working in all varieties of ways, and some of them very hard and very trying. The theory is that men are arranged on the one side of a room and the women on the other, that the men know about politics and take an interest in them, and that the women do not, and have no concern in public affairs. The fact is that the two are intermingled all through wherever you choose to look, engaged in the same or similar occupations, and that the women do care about these things as much as the men. Now, as to the indifference and apathy on the subject. These arise from various causes. Partly it is a sort of common feeling. Why do people trouble themselves about politics? The view is as if politics were a kind of dabbling in the mire, which is

a very low and insufficient view of politics. People may not engage in all sorts of varieties of questions, yet, on the other hand, any person who does not know what is going on, and chooses certain things to like and to dislike, is not acting up to the full privilege of a citizen or human being. (Applause.) Without detaining you longer, and without going into the argument on the question in a minute way, I may say that we hold this to be an important and pressing question, because we think that it is wrong that many burdens should be imposed on women without their having any voice beforehand in the question whether they should be imposed; because we think it wrong that in a great many questions of legislation affecting the daily lives and interests of women—women themselves should not be consulted; because we say that at present there is a demand and new scope for the energies of women, and the development of their powers in all directions. Professor Masson went on to say that he did not think that the difficulties in their way would be thoroughly removed till in some constituency some conspicuous opponent of the rights of women should be turned out visibly by the votes of women; and when the representatives of other constituencies should look on and learn the lesson. They thought it a pressing and important question, also, because they believed that general politics should be elevated, and that there would be no loss but gain from having the ideas and views of women on all general questions; and they thought it a particularly pressing question at this time, when the proposal was to enfranchise the whole population of the agricultural labourers without any proposal equally definite to bring women into the suffrage. They held that, without pronouncing any opinion on that question, for or against, on its own merits, that there was a positive danger for women if it was carried unless their suffrage was carried with it. They foresaw, in fact, that there was a danger that the interests of women would suffer and be trampled down under this vast coming enlargement of the pell-mell of merely masculine feet. (Applause.) Professor Masson concluded by calling on Miss Wigham to read the report. The report and statement of accounts was read by Miss Wigham, the hon. secretary. Professor Hodgson moved the adoption of this report, which was seconded by Miss Becker, and carried. Other resolutions were supported by Mr. Macfie, of Dreghorn; Miss Beedy, Mr. Robertson, and Mr Lewis, and after the usual votes of thanks the meeting separated.

DRAWING ROOM MEETINGS.

A series of drawing room meetings has been held in Edinburgh during the winter season. The first was given by Miss Craig, at her residence, 6, Carlton-street, on December 28th. It was well attended, and was addressed by Mrs. Masson and other ladies and gentlemen. Lively conversation ensued, and many adherents were gained to the movement. A meeting of a somewhat different character, still more numerously attended, was held in Mrs. Masson's drawing-room, 10, Regent Terrace. Addresses were given by Mrs. Masson, Mrs. S. Wellstood, Miss Wigham, Rev. Mr. Seton, Councillor Somerville, and Professor Masson; while many spontaneous testimonies from ladies and gentlemen present were given to the justice and probable usefulness of according the franchise to women. Another meeting was held at 2, Victoria Terrace, Portobello. The fourth was given by Mrs. Macqueen, on February 4th, at 3, Landsdowne crescent. The attendance was very large. Mrs. Macqueen presided, and the meeting was addressed by Mrs. Masson and Miss Wigham. A large and influential drawing-room meeting was held on February 16th at the residence of T. W. Greig, Esq., 21, Palmerston Place. Mrs. Duncan M'Laren occupied the chair, and addresses were

given by Miss Beedy and Miss Becker. The sixth meeting was given by Mrs. M'Laren, at Newington House. The assembly was addressed by Miss Becker. Resolutions were passed at all these meetings in favour of women's suffrage, and petitions were signed praying Parliament to pass the bill entitled "A Bill to Remove the Electoral Disabilities of Women." Many volunteer canvassers also offered themselves to aid in procuring names to petitions.

HANLEY.

A public meeting was held in the Mechanics Institute, Hanley, on February 21st. The Mayor of Hanley (Mr. J. Baker) presided, and on the platform were Mrs. Lucas, Miss Beedy, Mrs. Leslie, and Mrs. Ashford; Rev. Dr. Massingham, Rev. D. Horne, Rev. J. Legge; Messrs. J. G. Walker, C. Adams, J. S. Crapper, J. R. Cooke, W. Woodall, O. Lodge, W. H. Bishop, and J. L. Hamshaw. Resolutions in support of Mr. Forsyth's Bill were supported by the above-named ladies and gentlemen, and carried unanimously.

STAFFORD.

A large and influential meeting was held in the Lyceum, Stafford, on February 22nd. Resolutions approving the principle of Mr. Forsyth's Bill, and requesting the borough and county members to support it, were unanimously and enthusiastically carried.

LONDON.

A drawing-room meeting was held at the residence of Mrs. G. H. Lewis, 88, Portland Place, under the presidency of Mr. Charles Hancock. About eighty persons were present, and the meeting was addressed in support of the principle by Mrs. Besant, Mr. Mills, Miss A. Shore. Mr. Edward Maitland, Mr. F. H. Lewis, and Mr. Sickel also took part in the discussion, and after a vote of thanks to the chairman, proposed by Miss Blackman, the proceedings terminated.

Miss Craigen has held public meetings at MURTON COLLIERY, county Durham, on January 15th, 1876, Mr. Enoch Rogers in the chair; and on January 22nd, at EASINGTON LANE, county Durham, Mr. John Howe, chairman; on January 4th, in the Temperance Hall, WALLSEND, Northumberland, Mr. James Purvis in the chair; and at LIMERICK, Stirlingshire, in the Schoolroom, on February 9th, Mr. John Hogg in the chair. Petitions were signed on behalf of these meetings by the chairmen of each respectively.

HEALEY LIBERAL ASSOCIATION.

Miss Becker was present at the annual meeting of the Healey Liberal Association, which was held in the United Methodist Free Church school, at Healey, near Rochdale, on February 19th. Mr Councillor W. Lord officiated as chairman, and there was a large attendance.—Miss Becker, in moving the first resolution in favour of the extension of the franchise to all rate-payers, assimilation of the county with the borough franchise, and redistribution of electoral power, alluded to the Bill brought in by Mr. Forsyth, remarking that there was a prospect of an early success for that measure, provided there was an earnest demand for it. The country was ripe for it. The leaders of both political parties were agreed upon the subject. This Bill must be carried first, as it was more needed than the other two measures in the programme of the association. Mr. W. Bell, of Heywood, seconded the motion, which was supported by Mr. G. Lomax, of Manchester, and carried with applause.—*Abridged from the Manchester Examiner and Times.*

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN WYOMING.

Hon. John W. Kingman, of Wyoming, for four years a judge of the Supreme Court of that territory, was recently invited by the joint special committee of the Massachusetts Legislature on woman suffrage, to give an account of the history and practical working of woman suffrage in Wyoming. Judge Kingman testified substantially as follows:—

Wyoming was organized as a Territory in May, 1869. It contained at that time about 15,000 inhabitants, who had been brought thither by the building of the Union Pacific Railroad; there were comparatively few women then; for some years afterwards the population decreased owing to the incursions of the Indians, but has now reached about the same figure, and is rapidly increasing. The women are now in number, compared with the men, about in the ratio of nine women to ten men. The capital is Cheyenne, which casts about 1,500 votes. Laramie City, in which I reside, is next in size, and casts 1,500 votes, all at one voting precinct. The population is mostly on the line of the railroad and in the mining camps in its vicinity. In August, 1869, the first Territorial Legislature extended suffrage to all adult inhabitants.

There is practically no limitation of the franchise for either men or women in our territory. The term of residence required is very brief, and the instant a foreigner declares his or her intention to become a citizen the right to vote and hold office is conceded. Woman suffrage was inaugurated without much discussion, and without any general movement of men or women in its favour. Some of the members urged it from conviction, others voted for it thinking it would attract attention to the Territory, others as a joke, and others in the expectation that the Governor would veto the measure. When the law was enacted it was viewed with indifference by some, with dislike by others, and with warm regard by many. At that day there were comparatively few women there, and few of them voted. At each election since, they have voted in large numbers, and now nearly all go to the polls. At our last election a larger proportion of women voted than of men.

Our women do not as yet attend the caucuses in any considerable numbers, but they generally take an interest in the selection of candidates, and it is very common now, in considering the availability of an aspirant for office, to ask, "How does he stand with the ladies?" Frequently the men set aside certain applicants for office because their characters would not stand the criticism of women.

The women manifest a great deal of independence in their preference of candidates, and have frequently defeated bad nominations. They are becoming every year more and more interested in public affairs; they are less under the influence of private interest, friendship, and party feeling, and are less subject to the temptations which bias the political action of men.

The opposition to woman suffrage, at first, was pretty bitter. The measure was passed by a Democratic Legislature and approved by a Republican Governor. At the next election several Democrats were defeated by the women. It was thought that the law was working unfavourably for that party. At the second Legislature (1871) a large proportion of the Democratic members were inclined to repeal it, and did repeal it, by a strict party vote, every Republican voting for woman suffrage, every Democrat against it. But the Governor vetoed the repeal, a compromise was effected, and the law remained in force. In the third Legislature the Democrats were still largely predominant, and could have repealed the law had they been so disposed. But public sentiment had changed; there was less opposition. In the last Legislature (1875) only one member

was opposed to woman suffrage. He was an intemperate person, formerly Postmaster at Cheyenne, who had become a defaulter, had drifted off to another part of the territory and was there elected. This man made a motion to repeal, but could not find any one to second it, and was actually hooted down; and, when he returned home, his constituents threatened to Lynch him.

This change of public sentiment is radical. Our Congressional delegate, Col. Steele, was formerly bitterly opposed, and in the Legislature of 1871 made a violent speech against it. Now he is strongly in its favour, and so is his wife. Another leading opponent, a member from Wisconsin, an ardent Democratic politician, was bitterly hostile, and so was his wife. But last summer he announced that he and his wife had altered their minds; it had done a great deal of good; he should oppose its repeal. He was elected Speaker of the House, and he and his wife and daughter are entirely converted. A similar change has taken place in the views of intelligent women generally. For instance, I will name a most charitable and exemplary English lady, the wife of a bank president in Laramie City, an Episcopalian, who thought it was religiously wrong, and who opposed it as unfeminine, unladylike and unchristian. Now she is earnestly in its favour, takes a personal interest in the selection of candidates, goes to her neighbours to ask them to vote for good men and against bad men. She now regards the exercise of suffrage as a duty. I could name many others; the change of sentiment is so general that no attempt to repeal the law would now avail. I do not think you could get a dozen respectable men in any locality to oppose it.

At our first election, before women voted, we had a perfect pandemonium. The saloons were all open. Whiskey was dealt out freely by the candidates to all who would vote for them. The streets were filled with men partially intoxicated, all armed with knives and pistols; it was dangerous to pass through them; the bullets were flying at random. I believe none were killed outright, but many were severely wounded.

At the next election women voted, and perfect order prevailed. The miners and railroad labourers were still there; the gamblers and saloon-keepers also. (Our saloons are all kept by men; I do not know of one that is kept by a woman.) Political parties on one side and another still gave the saloon money to distribute free rum on election day. But at the polls, where before it was so rough, perfect order prevailed, and has prevailed ever since. I have never heard of a single case of a lady being insulted or treated with disrespect at elections.

To show the good effect of women's vote, Judge Kingman instanced a recent municipal election in Laramie City, where the best men of both parties had united in the nomination of a "People's ticket." The saloon-keepers, knowing that the Sunday law against the sale of liquor would be rigidly enforced if this ticket was elected, got out another ticket the night before election, sent out runners to meet the floating population coming in from the mines, gave free liquor and lunches, and rolled up a very large vote. Finding themselves in danger of defeat, the "law and order" party sent to every house to notify the ladies how the case stood, and in the afternoon the women turned out and worked against the saloons; among them many of the wives of the saloon-keepers and candidates, and they elected the temperance ticket by a handsome majority. Without the women the reformers would have been beaten two to one.

I do not believe that suffrage causes women to neglect their domestic affairs. Certainly such has not been the case in Wyoming; and I never heard a man complain that his wife was less interested in domestic economy because she had the right and took an interest in making the community respectable.

Judge Kingman related several instances of the conversion of the public men of the Territory to the cause, and the way in which they had come to regard it as one of the settled principles of the polity of the Territory.

Judge Kingman thought their experience refutes the objection that women would unsex themselves. The effect of the exercise of political rights upon the women themselves, of course, cannot yet be fully apparent.

In answer to an inquiry whether woman suffrage would not result in disorder at the North End of Boston, Judge Kingman said he would have no fear of disorder at any polls where women voted, even in the worst precincts of our great cities.

For more than an hour Judge Kingman was subjected to a searching cross-examination, both by the committee and the audience, giving a full and satisfactory explanation upon every point, and making a very favourable impression upon those present.

MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE.—ADMISSION OF WOMEN.—At an adjourned meeting of the Trustees of Manchester New College, held on February 9, the following resolution moved by Mr. R. D. Darbishire (Manchester), and seconded by Mr. J. Lupton (Leeds), was carried by a large majority.

The French papers report that a young lady, daughter of M. Benoist, principal of the school of Fontenay-le-Comte (Vendee), has just passed a brilliant examination for the degree of bachelor of letters, at the University of Poitiers.

WOMEN AS LAND SURVEYORS.—The Times of India states that it is not very improbable that before long Burmese women will be employed as land surveyors in the Amherst district.

WOMEN AND NAVIGATION.

A correspondent writes as follows with reference to the comments of the Pall Mall Gazette on the achievement of Mrs. Crowell, who, when her husband's ship was disabled during a severe gale, in which the captain and mate were injured, and rendered incapable of managing the vessel, assumed command of the ship, she being the only other person on board who understood navigation, took observations, ascertained the latitude and longitude, maintained her place on the bridge, and after a stormy voyage of 58 days, during which the vessel encountered violent gales, and shipped heavy seas, conducted the vessel with its valuable cargo safely into the port of Buenos Ayres.

PETITIONS.

HOUSE OF COMMONS. FIRST REPORT. 8—15 February, 1876.

I. Parliament.

WOMEN'S DISABILITIES REMOVAL BILL—In Favour.

Table with columns: NO., DATE, PLACE, PRESENTED BY, NO. OF SIGNATURES. Lists petitions from various locations like Manchester, Leeds, and Barnsley.

Table with columns: NO., DATE, PLACE, PRESENTED BY, NO. OF SIGNATURES. Lists petitions from locations like Padiham, Leeds, Manchester, and Halifax.

Total number of Petitions 52—Signatures 43,054

SECOND REPORT. 16—18 February, 1876.

Table with columns: NO., DATE, PLACE, PRESENTED BY, NO. OF SIGNATURES. Lists petitions from locations like Keynsham, Woolwich, Plumstead, and Maldon.

Total number of Petitions 83—Signatures 51,756

SUMMARY OF PETITIONS UP TO FEBRUARY 18th, 1876. Table with columns: No. of Petitions, Total signed Officially, No. of Women's Disabilities Bill—In favour.

BRISTOL AND WEST OF ENGLAND SOCIETY.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS FOR JANUARY AND FEBRUARY, 1876.

Table with columns: Name, Amount (£ s. d.). Lists names like The Misses Ashworth, Miss Estlin, Professor F. W. Newman, etc.

£14 8 0

ALAN GREENWELL, Treasurer, 1, Westbourne Villas, Clifton, Bristol.

Office: 53, Park Street, Bristol.

MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR
WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS RECEIVED DURING
FEBRUARY, 1876.

	£	s.	d.
Mr. Thomasson	130	0	0
A Lancashire Merchant	100	0	0
A Lover of Pluck	50	0	0
Mr. W. E. Briggs, M.P.	5	0	0
Mrs. Markham	3	0	0
Mrs. Chas. Holland	2	2	0
Miss E. L. M. Praed	2	0	0
Rev. H. Cholmley	1	1	6
Mrs. McCulloch	1	1	0
Mrs. McKinnel	1	1	0
Mrs. Jesse Haworth	1	1	0
Mrs. Helen Bright Clark	1	1	0
Mr. Joseph Phythian	1	1	0
Miss Jaffrey	1	0	0
Mrs. Bradney	1	0	0
Mr. H. Biggs	1	0	0
Mrs. Yates	1	0	0
Mr. S. Marshall	0	10	0
Mr. James Hill	0	5	0
Mrs. Letherbrow	0	5	0
Mrs. Todd (Leeds)	0	5	0
Mrs. Bleakley	0	5	0
Mr. Davis (Walsall)	0	3	0
Mrs. Woodhead (Leeds)	0	2	6
Mr. Yeasley	0	2	6
Mrs. Stroyan	0	2	6
Mrs. Thomas (Llandyssell)	0	2	6
Mrs. Byers (Belfast)	0	2	6
Mr. John Maude	0	2	6
Mrs. Howell	0	1	10
YORK.			
Mrs. Smithson	1	1	0
Mrs. H. Richardson	1	1	0
Misses Wilkinson	1	0	0
Mr. Jonathan Burt	1	0	0
Mrs. Mason	1	0	0
Mrs. Spence	1	0	0
"Gamma"	1	0	0
Mrs. Alfred Spence	0	10	0
Mrs. Fielden Thorpe	0	10	0
Rev. John Hunter	0	10	0
Mrs. Henry Richardson	0	10	0
Mr. Medley	0	10	0
Miss Snarey	0	10	0
Miss Swaine	0	5	0
"Delta"	0	5	0
Ven. Archdeacon Hey	0	5	0
Miss Rous	0	5	0
Mr. R. Thompson	0	5	0
Mr. J. W. Procter	0	5	0
"Sigma"	0	5	0
"Iota"	0	5	0
Mr. Thomas Monkhouse	0	2	6
Mrs. Smith	0	2	6
DERBY.			
Mr. T. Roe, jun.	2	2	0
Mr. F. Longdon, J.P.	1	1	0
Mr. John Renals	0	10	6
Misses Holbrooke	0	10	6
Mr. A. Laing	0	10	0
Mrs. Roe	0	10	0
Mr. John Lamb	0	5	0
Mr. W. Hall	0	5	0
Mr. A. W. Pollard	0	5	0
Mr. E. Ellis	0	5	0
Mr. F. Earp	0	5	0
Mr. Thomas Copestick	0	5	0
Mr. James Owen	0	5	0
Mr. Richard Binns	0	5	0
Miss Peick	0	5	0
Rev. W. Crosbie, M.A.	0	3	0
Mr. W. Hobson	0	2	6
Mr. Joseph Jones	0	2	6
Mr. W. Newton	0	2	6
Miss Dewe	0	2	6
Mr. S. Hall	0	2	6
Miss Shelton	0	2	6
LICHFIELD.			
Mr. Charles Simpson	1	0	0
N. W. J.	0	5	0
Mr. McLean	0	5	0
Mr. Gillard	0	2	6
Mr. J. Southern	0	2	6
Carried forward	327	7	4

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS (continued).

	£	s.	d.
Brought forward	327	7	4
HANLEY.			
Mr. John Baker (Mayor)	1	1	0
Mr. J. J. Walker	1	1	0
Mr. J. Crapper	1	1	0
Mr. Oliver Lodge	1	1	0
Mr. Wm. Woodall	1	1	0
Mr. Arthur Challinor	1	1	0
Mr. T. Worthington	1	1	0
Mr. J. Hamshaw	1	1	0
Messrs. S. and R. Gilman	0	10	6
Mr. Ambrose Bevington	0	10	6
Mr. Thomas Hughes	0	10	6
Mr. John R. Cooke	0	10	6
Mr. Charles Adams	0	10	6
Mr. W. W. Bishop	0	10	0
Mrs. Leslie	0	10	0
	£339	7	10

S. ALFRED STEINTHAL, Treasurer.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

Contributions to the funds of the Central Committee of the National Society for Women's Suffrage, 64, Berners Street, London, W., from January 21st to February 20th, 1876.

	£	s.	d.
Miss J. Boucherett	10	0	0
Miss Bostock	5	0	0
Mrs. Sims	2	2	0
Lady Buchan	2	0	0
Mrs. Mills	2	0	0
Miss E. L. M. Praed	2	0	0
Mrs. Scholefield	2	0	0
Mr. A. W. Bennett	1	1	0
Mrs. Andrew Laurie	1	1	0
Mr. Galpin	1	1	0
Mrs. E. M. Taylor	1	0	0
Mr. Jenkins	0	10	6
Mr. T. F. Brooke	0	10	0
Mr. T. Young	0	10	0
Miss Bird	0	5	0
Mrs. Charlesworth	0	5	0
Mrs. Larner	0	5	0
Mr. R. S. Olding	0	5	0
Mrs. Charles Rennick	0	5	0
J. D. S.	0	3	0
Miss S. E. Gay	0	2	6
Miss Lewin	0	2	0
	£32	8	0

ALFRED W. BENNETT, Treasurer.

YORKSHIRE SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

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

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS RECEIVED IN
FEBRUARY, 1876.

	£	s.	d.
Mrs. Scatcherd	(donation)	5	0
Mr. M. M. Warburg	2	2	0
Mrs. Baily	1	1	0
Mrs. John Marshall	1	1	0
Mr. John Lupton	1	1	0
Miss Carbutt	1	0	0
Mrs. Luccock	0	10	0
Miss Wilkinson	0	10	0
Mr. E. A. Lupton	0	10	0
Miss Pierson	0	5	0
Miss Holland	0	5	0
Mrs. Edwin Thorne	0	5	0
Dr. Willis	0	2	6
Mr. D. T. Ingham	0	2	6
Mr. Edward Pulleyn	0	2	6
Mrs. J. S. Baily	0	2	6
Mrs. Wood	0	2	6
Mrs. Ellis	0	2	6
Mrs. Wm. Ellis	0	2	6
Mrs. Abernethy	0	2	6
Mrs. Stone	0	2	6
	£14	12	6

Springfield Mount, Leeds.

CELIA WALKER, Treasurer.