

degradation. She has not excelled because she has had no fair chance to excel. Man, placing his foot on her shoulder, has taunted her with not rising. But the ulterior question remains behind—How came she into this attitude originally? Explain this explanation, the logician fairly demands. Granted that woman is weak, because she has been systematically degraded; but why was she so degraded? This is a far deeper question—one to be met only by a profounder philosophy and a positive solution. We are coming on ground almost wholly untrod, and must do the best we can.

“I venture to assert, then, that woman’s social inferiority in the past has been to a great extent a legitimate thing. To all appearance history would have been impossible without it, just as it would have been impossible without an epoch of war and slavery. It is simply a matter of social progress—a part of the succession of civilizations. The past has been inevitably a period of ignorance, of engrossing physical necessities, and of brute force—not of freedom, of philanthropy, and of culture. During that lower epoch, woman was necessarily an inferior, degraded by abject labour even in time of peace—degraded uniformly by war, chivalry to the contrary, notwithstanding. . . . The truth simply was, that her time had not come. Physical strength must rule for a time, and she was the weaker . . . and the degradation of woman was simply a part of a system which has indeed had its day, but has bequeathed its associations. . . . The reason, then, for the long subjection of woman has been simply that humanity was passing through its first epoch, and her full career was to be reserved for the second. . . . Woman’s appointed era, like that of the Teutonic races, was delayed but not omitted. It is not merely true that the empire of the past has belonged to man, for it was an empire of the muscles, enlisting, at best, but the lower parts of the understanding. There can be no question that the present epoch is initiating an empire of the higher reason, of arts, affections, aspirations; and for that epoch the genius of woman has been reserved. Till the fulness of time came, woman was necessarily kept a slave to the spinning-wheel and the needle; now higher work is ready; peace has brought invention to her aid, and the mechanical means for her emancipation are ready also.”*

* “Ought Women to learn the Alphabet?” By T. W. Higginson.

SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

OF THE

MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

PRESENTED AT THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING,
NOVEMBER 13th, 1874.

MANCHESTER:
ALEXANDER IRELAND & CO., PRINTERS.
1874.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

1873—1874.

THE Report which your Committee have to present of their work during the past year differs materially from that of former years. The School Board elections of November, 1873, with other circumstances, caused the delay of the annual meeting a month beyond the usual date, and no public meetings were arranged by your Committee before Christmas.

The first important event of the new year was the assembling of a Conference at Birmingham, on January 22nd, at which representatives of all the leading societies were present. Your Committee prepared a draft Memorial to Mr. Gladstone, who was then Prime Minister, which, with a few verbal alterations, was approved by the other committees, and adopted at the Conference. The following is the text of the Memorial:—

To the Right Honourable WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE, M.P., First Lord of Her Majesty's Treasury.

The Memorial of Members and Friends of the National Society for Women's Suffrage in Conference assembled at Birmingham, January 22, 1874.

Sheweth—

That your memorialists earnestly desire to urge on the attention of Her Majesty's Government the justice and expediency of abolishing the disability which precludes women, otherwise legally qualified, from voting in the election of Members of Parliament.

They submit that the disability is anomalous, inasmuch as it exists only in respect to the Parliamentary franchise. The electoral rights of women have been from time immemorial equal and similar to those of men in parochial and other ancient franchises, and in the year 1869 a measure was passed, with the sanction of the Administration of which

you are the head, restoring and confirming the rights of women ratepayers to the exercise of the municipal franchise.

The electoral disability is further anomalous because by the law and constitution of this realm women are not disabled from the exercise of political power. Writs returning members to serve in the House of Commons, signed by women as electors or returning officers, are now in existence, and the validity of such returns has never been disputed. Women who were heirs to peerages and other dignities exercised judicial jurisdiction and enjoyed other privileges appertaining to such offices and lordships without disability of sex. The highest political function known to the constitution may be exercised by a woman. The principle that women may have political power is coeval with the British constitution. On the other hand, the practice of women taking part in voting at popular elections is equally ancient in date, and has been restored and extended by the action of the present Parliament. Your Memorialists therefore submit that to bring existing principle and practice into harmony by removing the disability which prevents women who vote in local elections from voting in the election of Members of Parliament, would be a step in the natural process of development by which institutions, while retaining the strength and authority derived from the traditions of the past, and preserving the continuity of the national life, continually undergo such modifications as are needed in order to adapt them to the exigencies of the age and the changed conditions of modern life.

They also submit that the old laws regulating the qualifications of electors do not limit the franchise to male persons: that the laws under which women exercised the parochial franchise were couched in the same general terms as those regulating the Parliamentary suffrage, and that while the latter were not expressly limited to men, the former were not expressly extended to women. There is, therefore, a strong presumption that the exclusion of women from the Parliamentary suffrage was an infringement on their ancient constitutional rights, rendered possible in a barbarous age by the comparative weakness and smallness of the numbers of persons affected by it, and continued until the exclusion had become customary. The franchise of women in local elections has been from time to time under judicial consideration, and their right to take part in such elections has been repeatedly confirmed by the judges. During the arguments in these cases, the question of their right to vote in the election of Members of Parliament was frequently mooted, and conflicting opinions thereon incidentally expressed by various judges, but the matter was never judicially decided, and no authoritative judgment was ever given against the right until the year 1868, after the passing of two modern Acts of Parliament in 1832 and 1867, the former of which, for the first time in English history, in terms limited the franchise created by it to every "male person," and the latter to every "man" qualified under its provisions. Your Memorialists submit that had the question of the right of women to vote in the election of Members of Parliament been raised in the law courts under the old statutes, which contain no reference to sex, and before the passing of the limiting Acts of 1862 and 1867, that the precedents which had determined the right in their favour in the construction of the law as to local government must have been held to apply to the case of qualified freeholders or others who claimed the right as regards Parliamentary government.

They submit also, that even after these limiting Acts, women had reasonable grounds for claiming the suffrage under the existing law. There is an Act of Parliament which declares that "in all Acts, words importing the masculine gender shall be deemed and taken to include females, . . . unless the contrary is expressly provided." The Act of 1867 contained clauses imposing personal liabilities and pecuniary burdens on certain classes of ratepayers. In these clauses, as in the enfranchising clauses, and throughout the Act, words importing the masculine gender were alone used. No provision was made that these words should not include females. Accordingly, in enforcing the Act, the extra liabilities and burdens were imposed on women ratepayers, to many of whom they caused grievous hardship. There was, therefore, reason to expect that the enfranchising clauses would bear the same interpretation, inasmuch as they were confessedly offered as an equivalent for the increased liabilities. But when the women who had been subjected to the liabilities claimed their votes, they found that words importing the masculine gender were held to include women in the clauses imposing burdens, and to exclude them in the clauses conferring privileges, in one and the same Act of Parliament.

This kind of injustice was shown in a marked manner in the case of certain women ratepayers of Bridgewater, who, in a Memorial addressed to you in 1871, set forth the grievance of most heavy and unjust taxation which was levied on them, in common with the other householders of that disfranchised borough, for the payment of a prolonged commission respecting political bribery. The Memorialists felt it to be unjust and oppressive, inasmuch as not exercising the franchise, nor being in any way directly or indirectly concerned in the malpractices which led to the commission, they were nevertheless required to pay not less than three shillings in the pound, according to their rental. To that Memorial you caused a reply to be sent through Mr. Secretary Bruce, stating that "it was not in the power of the Secretary of State to exempt women owning or occupying property from the local and imperial taxation to which that property is liable." While fully admitting this, your Memorialists beg to represent that it is in the power of the Legislature to secure to women the vote which their property would confer, along with its liability to local and imperial taxation, were it owned or occupied by men.

They submit that this concession has recently been granted in respect to local taxation, and that if justice demands that women should have a voice in controlling the municipal expenditure to which their property contributes, justice yet more urgently demands that they should have a voice in controlling the imperial expenditure to which the same property is liable. The local expenditure of the country amounts to about £30,000,000, the imperial expenditure to about £70,000,000 annually; if, therefore, the matter be regarded as one of taxation only, the latter vote is of more importance than the former. Local government deals with men and women alike, and knows no distinction between male and female ratepayers. But imperial government deals with men and women on different principles, and in such a manner that whenever there is any distinction made in the rights, privileges and protection accorded to them respectively, the difference is always against women and always in favour of men. They believe this state of things is a

natural result of the exclusion of women from representation, and that it will be found impracticable to amend it until women are admitted to a share in controlling the Legislature.

By the deprivation of the Parliamentary vote, women, in the purchase or renting of property, obtain less for their money than men. In a Bill which passed the House of Commons last session, provision was made for the amalgamation in one list of the municipal and Parliamentary register of electors. In that list it appeared that the same house, the same rent, and the same taxes, conferred on a man the double vote in municipal and Parliamentary government, and on a woman the single vote only, and that the less honourable and important one. When the occupation of a house is transferred from a man to a woman, say to the widow of the former owner, that home loses the privilege of representation in the imperial government, though its relations with the taxgatherer continue unaltered. There have been various societies formed with a view to enable persons to acquire portions of landed or real property, partly for the sake of the vote attached to such property. Should a woman purchase or inherit such an estate, the vote, which has been one important consideration in determining the value, would be lost, through her legal disability to exercise it.

The deprivation of the vote is a serious disadvantage to women in the competition for farms. A case is recorded of one estate in Suffolk from which seven widows have been ejected, who, if they had possessed votes, would have been continued as tenants. A sudden ejection often means ruin to a family who have sunk capital in the land, and it is only too probable that no day passes without the occurrence of some such calamity to some unhappy widow, who, but for the electoral disability, might have retained the home and the occupation by which she could have brought up her family in comfort and independence.

Besides this definite manner in which the electoral disability injures women farmers, it has a more or less directly injurious influence on all self-dependent women who maintain themselves and their families by other than domestic labour. A disability, the basis of which is the presumed mental or moral incapacity of the subject of it to form a rational judgment on matters within the ordinary ken of human intelligence, carries with it a stigma of inferiority calculated to cause impediment to the entrance on or successful prosecution of any pursuit demanding recognised ability and energy. This presumed incapacity is probably the origin of the general neglect of the education of women, which is only now beginning to be acknowledged, and the absence of political power in the neglected class renders it difficult if not impossible to obtain an adequate share for girls in the application of educational funds and endowments. So long as women are specifically excluded from control over their Parliamentary representatives, so long will their interests be postponed to the claims of those who have votes to give; and while Parliament shall continue to declare that the voices of women are unfit to be taken into account in choosing members of the Legislature, the masses of men will continue to act as if their wishes, opinions, and interests were undeserving of serious consideration.

It is now nearly two years since you, in your place in the House of Commons, said that the number of absolutely self-dependent women is increasing from year to year, and that the progressive increase in the number of

such women is a very serious fact, because those women are assuming the burdens that belong to men; and you stated your belief that when they are called upon to assume those burdens, and to undertake the responsibility of providing for their own subsistence, they approach the task under greater difficulties than attach to their more powerful competitors. Your Memorialists therefore ask you to aid women in overcoming these difficulties, by assisting to place them, politically at least, on a level with those whom you designate as "their more powerful competitors."

One of the greatest hindrances in the path of self-dependent women is the opposition shown by members of many trades and professions to women who attempt to engage in them. The medical and academical authorities of the university of Edinburgh have successfully crushed the attempt of a small band of lady students to qualify themselves for the medical profession, and the same spirit of "trades unionism" is rife in the industrial community. A few months ago, the printers of Manchester, learning that a few girls were practising type-setting, and endeavouring to earn a little money thereby, instantly passed a rule ordaining a strike in the shop of any master printer who should allow type set up by women to be sent to his machines to be worked. At the present time, in a manufacturing district in Yorkshire where there are "broad" and "narrow" looms, at the former of which much more money can be earned, the men refuse to allow women to work at the broad looms, though they are quite able to manage them, because the work is considered too remunerative for women. At Nottingham there is a particular machine at which very high wages can be earned, at which women now work, and the men, in order to drive women out of such profitable employment, have insisted on the masters taking no more women on, but as those at present employed leave, supplying their places by men. A master manufacturer reports: "We have machines which women can manage quite as well or better than men, yet are they not permitted by a selfish combination of the strong against the 'weak.' These are only samples of the cases that are constantly occurring of successful attempts to drive women out of remunerative occupations. Your Memorialists submit that women would be more able to resist such attempts if they had the protection of the suffrage; and that men would be less likely to be thus aggressive and oppressive if they had learned to regard women as their political equals.

Besides the restrictions on the industrial liberties of women affected by combinations of men, there are existing and proposed legislative restrictions from which men are exempt, and which exercise a powerful influence on the market for their labour. For the coming session we have the proposal further to limit their hours of paid labour in factories, and to place other restrictions on their labour in shops, also a proposition to place married women on the footing of half-timers. Without here expressing any opinion as to the wisdom of these proposals, we urge that members of the House of Commons would be more capable of dealing with them in a just and appreciative spirit if they were responsible for their votes to the persons whose interests are directly concerned, and whose liberties they are asked to curtail; and, further, that it is a grave question how far it is safe to trust the industrial interests of women as a class to the irresponsible control of the men

who have manifested to individuals and to sections of working women the spirit indicated by the examples we have cited.

In the same speech you spoke of a state of the law in which the balance is generally cast too much against women, and too much in favour of men. Since you directed your attention to this matter, you have not been able either to introduce or to assist others who have introduced measures to ameliorate the state of the law respecting women, and such proposals have been unable to win consideration from Parliament. Your memorialists cannot believe that this neglect has arisen from want of a desire on your part to deal with the grievances under which you have admitted that your countrywomen suffer; they are, therefore, led to the conclusion that you have been unable to take into consideration the affairs of an unrepresented class, owing to the pre-occupation of Parliament with the concerns of those to whom it is directly responsible.

You stated that "the question was to devise a method of enabling women to exercise a sensible influence, without undertaking personal functions, and exposing themselves to personal obligations inconsistent with the fundamental particulars of their condition as women," and that the objection to the personal attendance of women at elections was in your mind an objection of the greatest force. They respectfully submit that the exercise of the municipal franchise involves the personal attendance of women at the polls, and that since your words were uttered changes have been effected which render the process of voting absolutely identical for municipal and Parliamentary elections, and the whole proceeding perfectly decorous and orderly. Experience has proved that women can vote at municipal elections without prejudice to the fundamental particulars of their condition as women, whatever these may be; and this experience shows that they may vote in Parliamentary elections without the smallest personal prejudice or inconvenience. The School Board elections have also shown that women can appeal to large constituencies and go through the ordeal of public meetings, addresses, and questions from electors, to which men must submit who seek the suffrages of a great community, without any sacrifice of womanly dignity, or of the respect and consideration accorded to their position and their sex. They therefore submit that events have obviated the objections you entertained in 1871 to the proposal to give representation to women, and that the course taken by the Administration over which you preside in assenting to the extension of the municipal and School Board franchise to them; in calling them to the public functions of candidates and members of School Boards; and lastly, of securing the passing of a law which renders the process of voting silent and secret, have taken away all reasonable grounds for objecting on the score of practical inconvenience to the admission of women to the exercise of a vote, which they would have to give in precisely the same manner, but not nearly so often, as those votes which they already deliver.

It has been said that there is neither desire nor demand for the measure, and further, that women do not care for and would not use the suffrage if they possessed it. But the demand for the Parliamentary franchise is enormously greater than was the demand for the Municipal franchise, and for the School Board franchise there was no apparent call. Yet these two measures were passed purely on their merits, and it was not

held to be necessary to impose on their promoters, over and above the obligation to make out their case, the condition that a majority of the women of England, or of a particular district, should petition for the proposed boon. Experience proved the wisdom and justice of this course, for although women throughout the country had taken no active part in agitating for the Municipal franchise, no sooner was the privilege accorded than they freely availed themselves of it, and statistics obtained from some of the largest boroughs in the kingdom show that from the first year in which women possessed the suffrage, they have voted in about equal proportion with men to the number of each on the register. The Parliamentary vote is more honourable and important than the Municipal vote; it is, therefore, safe to conclude that women who value and use the latter, will appreciate and exercise the former as soon as it shall be bestowed upon them. Your Memorialists submit that great injustice and injury is done by debarring these women from a voting power which there is such strong presumptive ground for believing that they would freely exercise but for the legal restraint.

Your Memorialists are especially moved to call your attention to the urgency of the claim at the present time, when a Bill extending the application of the principle of household suffrage is about to be proposed to Parliament, which Bill received last year such expressions of approval from members of Her Majesty's Government as to lead to the belief that they are willing to take the proposal into serious consideration. They submit that the claim and the need for representation of women householders is even more pressing than that of agricultural labourers. The grievances under which women suffer are equally great, and the demand for the franchise has been pressed by a much greater number of women, and for a much longer period of time than in the case of county householders now excluded. The number of persons who petitioned last session for the County Franchise Bill and for the Women's Disabilities Bill respectively were, for the former 1,889, and for the latter 329,206. The latter Bill has received most influential support from both sides of the House, and more votes have been recorded in its favour than have been given for any measure not directly supported as a party measure by one or other of the great parties in the State. Under these circumstances your Memorialists earnestly request that you will use your influence as leader of the House of Commons and of the Government to secure the passing of the Bill introduced by Mr. Jacob Bright, either as a substantive enactment, or as an integral portion of the next measure that shall be passed dealing with the question of the representation of the people.

Signed on behalf of the Conference,

CAROLINE M. TAYLOR,

PRESIDENT.

The receipt of the Memorial was duly acknowledged by Mr. Gladstone.

Your Committee determined to begin their season's work with a grand demonstration in the Free Trade Hall. The date was, after some difficulty, definitively fixed for Feb-

ruary 24th, and arrangements for this, and for other meetings, and for the general work of petitions, were proceeding with vigour, when the sudden announcement of the dissolution of Parliament, after it had been summoned to meet for the despatch of business, threw the affairs of your Committee, in common with the political business of the whole country, into surprise and confusion. Your Committee took such steps as time and the extent of their resources permitted to bring the question before the notice of candidates in the various constituencies. They forwarded a copy of the Birmingham Memorial and of the Women's Disabilities Bill to every candidate in England and Wales, and they caused placards explaining the principle to be extensively posted in many large towns.

The general election took place in the first week in February. To their unspeakable regret, your Committee have to record the loss by their able, accomplished, and devoted leader, of his seat in Parliament for this city. It is impossible to over-estimate the services rendered by Mr. Jacob Bright to the cause of the enfranchisement of women. In 1869 he introduced in the House of Commons an amendment on the Municipal Corporations Act, conferring on them the municipal franchise, and he urged this claim on the attention of Her Majesty's Government with such consummate tact, ability, and force, that they at once gave the measure their cordial support, and it was carried without opposition through both Houses of Parliament. As was well observed at the time by an eminent statesman, "This was a revolution, this vote meant the other, and there never was so great a revolution so speedily accomplished."

In the succeeding year Mr. Jacob Bright introduced the Bill to remove the disabilities of women in Parliamentary elections, and on May 4th, 1870, it was read a second time in the House of Commons, in a house of between 200 and 300, by a considerable majority. Then came a remarkable change; a sort of panic appeared to seize on the official mind, and under that panic machinery was set to work which more than once has been employed to upset just demands; the Government used its influence to crush the Bill, and it was rejected

on going into committee. But next year there was again a change. Mr. Disraeli came down to the House of Commons on a Wednesday in order to vote for the Bill, and Mr. Gladstone, who was present during the debate, withdrew his opposition after hearing the speech of the mover. In the speech in which he did so he congratulated the honourable gentleman on the ability with which he had stated his case, and observed that, while he would not say that the presence of Mr. Jacob Bright consoled him for the loss sustained by the absence of his distinguished relative, he took occasion to rejoice, that in that absence, the name of his family was so worthily represented. The Bill obtained an increasing amount of Parliamentary support during the four successive years in which Mr. Jacob Bright had the charge of it, a result which must be mainly attributed to the earnestness, tact, and political sagacity displayed by him in advocating the claim. Your Committee take this occasion of expressing their earnest hope that Mr. Jacob Bright may be speedily restored to a place in the House of Commons, which he is so eminently worthy to occupy.

Your Committee have also to regret the absence from the new Parliament of Mr. Eastwick, the seconder, and of about 70 supporters of the Bill. Some of their friends did not seek re-election, and others have since obtained seats. The total number of supporters now in the House of Commons, so far as their opinions have been declared, is 234; but in the absence of the authoritative test of a division list, it is impossible to arrive at a trustworthy estimate of the strength of the cause in the new Parliament. Against the loss of so many friends may be set the defeat of the leader of the opposition to the measure in the late Parliament, Mr. Bouverie, and of that of 105 members who voted against the Bill.

Comparing the new Parliament with the old, so far as the sentiments of members have been declared, we find that in the late Parliament there were at the time of the dissolution 227 members who had voted or declared themselves in favour of the Bill, and 328 against it—majority against, if they had all voted, of 101. The actual numbers last division were for the Bill, 155; against, 222; majority, 67. In the new Parliament

there are about 234 friends of the Bill, and about 230 supposed to be opponents, the hostile majority is therefore apparently reduced to a nullity. There are about 50 members who are neutral, that is, who were in the late Parliament, but who never voted on the question, and about 140 new members whose views are not known. There is here ample margin for turning our present large and powerful minority of declared supporters, which includes the Prime Minister and many of the most influential members of the House of Commons, into a majority, and your committee earnestly exhort all their friends to aid them in the efforts necessary to promote this consummation.

Deprived of the services of their late leader, the promoters of the measure sought to place it in the hands of some member of eminence and ability, under whose auspices it might command a favourable hearing in the new Parliament. Your Committee have pleasure in recording the acceptance of this task by Mr. Forsyth, Q.C., member for Marylebone. With him are associated the names of the Right Hon. James Stansfeld; the Right Hon. the Recorder of London, Mr. Russell Gurney; and Sir Robert Anstruther. These four names of men, each eminent in his own way, whose opinions differ so widely on matters of party politics, should be a sufficient guarantee to all thinking persons that the measure they introduce is moderate, reasonable, and just, and that it is one in which men of all shades of opinion in general politics may heartily concur in supporting.

Mr. Forsyth introduced his Bill on March 19th, but, owing to the short and exceptional character of the session, he was unable to obtain a favourable day for the second reading, and the Bill was withdrawn, by the concurrence of all interested in the matter, on the 16th July.

The lengthened period during which the Bill remained on the order book of the House of Commons, as compared with former sessions, necessitated a corresponding prolongation of the work of petitioning. In former years the Bill has usually been disposed of about the end of April, and the bulk of the petitions have been presented by the first week of May. But this year a constant stream of petitions was kept up until

nearly the end of July. During the whole of this period the columns of the *Times* recorded daily a long list of petitions for the Women's Disabilities Bill, a result which was owing to the energies and resources of the various societies and of individual friends of the cause. There were presented during the past session no fewer than 1,404 petitions, with 430,343 signatures, in favour of the Women's Disabilities Removal Bill. Of these, 203 petitions were from public meetings or municipal corporations, signed officially or under seal. The petitions last year numbered 919, with 329,206 signatures, showing an increase of 101,137 over the petitioners in 1873. The petitioners for women's suffrage greatly exceed those for any other object. Of the total number, 344 petitions, with 128,552 signatures, were presented through the agency of the Manchester Society and its friends.

In the spring, your Committee prepared Memorials to Mr. Disraeli and Mr. Gladstone, praying them to give their support to the Women's Disabilities Removal Bill, which Memorials were 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.

Mr. Gladstone addressed the following letter to Miss Becker, in reply to the Memorial:—

“21, Carlton House Terrace, July 14, 1874.

“Madam,—I have the honour to acknowledge the memorial, signed by names of so much distinction and by so large an aggregate, with reference to the legal disadvantages and disabilities of women.

“I do not recede from any statement that I have made in

Parliament during former years on this important question ; and I am glad that in one or more instances abusive provisions have recently been removed from the statute book. But I confine myself to this general statement, and reserve any more particular declaration with respect to any proposed mode of procedure for whatever I may deem a suitable occasion and for my place in Parliament.—I have the honour to be, madam, your most obedient, humble servant,

(Signed) “ W. E. GLADSTONE.

“ I hope that the circumstances which have recently occurred in my family will sufficiently excuse my delay in acknowledging the receipt of the memorial.”

The following is the text of the Memorials :—

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 for 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 and 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.

The public meetings began with a demonstration in the Free Trade Hall, on February 24th, under the presidency of Mr. Jacob Bright. The large hall was crowded to overflowing with an interested and sympathetic audience. This meeting was immediately succeeded by others in large towns in Yorkshire, and during the period between February 24th and May the 1st twenty-three meetings were held, under the management of your Committee, at the following places :—Sheffield, Huddersfield, York, Nottingham, Northampton, Leicester, Oldham, Stalybridge, Wigan, Blackburn, Llangefni, Amlwch, Holyhead, Aberystwith, Bala, Llangollen, Wrexham, Denbigh, Ruthin, Bangor, Portmadoc, Festiniog, Carnarvon. A lecture was given on September 7th, at Whitby.

During the summer months no meetings can be held with advantage, but your Committee have pleasure in reporting that they have begun the work for this season by a series of successful meetings, at the following places, during the month of October :—Grimsby, Hull, Thirsk, Northallerton, Middlesbrough, Ripon, West Hartlepool, and Darlington. After each of these meetings a systematic canvass for funds and for the enrolment of new members was undertaken, with a very gratify-

ing result. The greater portion of the cost of the meetings was covered by the subscriptions obtained, and a large number of new members were added to the ranks of the society. Your Committee recommend that this plan be continued, and that every meeting held in future shall be followed up after the manner described.

Your Committee have pleasure in reporting that the number of members of the Society has been nearly doubled during the past year. The sale of the *Women's Suffrage Journal* continues to increase, and it commands an augmented amount of interest and support.

The Bill to be introduced by Mr. Forsyth next session is the same in terms as that formerly in charge of Mr. Jacob Bright. The following is the text of the Bill :—

“ A Bill to Remove the Electoral Disabilities of Women.

“ 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.”

In order to give adequate support to the Parliamentary leaders, it is necessary that petitions, public meetings, and other demonstrations of public opinion, should be forthcoming in stronger force than ever. It behoves the friends of the cause to prove that the large numbers of petitions in former years represent not a spasmodic outburst of sentiment destined to subside, but a steady and increasing force of opinion in favour of a great principle. Your Committee appeal to their friends for aid to enable them to do their portion of the work, and they pledge themselves to devote their best energies to the fulfilment of the task entrusted to them.

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

Of the Society, held in the MAYOR'S PARLOUR, TOWN HALL,
MANCHESTER, November 13th, 1874.

JACOB BRIGHT, Esq., in the Chair.

The Secretary read the Report of the Executive Committee.

The Treasurer read the Statement of Accounts.

Resolution I.—Moved by William Forsyth, Esq., Q.C., M.P., seconded by Miss Lilius S. Ashworth :

That the Report and Statement of Accounts just read be adopted, and printed for circulation under the direction of the Executive Committee.

Resolution II.—Moved by Dr. Pankhurst, seconded by Whateley Cooke Taylor, Esq. :

That this meeting hereby record their sense of the inestimable value of the services rendered to the cause in the late Parliament by Mr. Jacob Bright, by introducing and obtaining the sanction of the Legislature to an amendment of the Municipal Corporations Act, giving the municipal franchise to women; by introducing the Women's Disabilities Bill, and by his able, faithful, and consistent advocacy of the measure during four successive sessions; this meeting also hereby express their deep regret that they are at present deprived of his Parliamentary services, and their earnest hope that he may soon be restored to a place in the House of Commons.

Resolution III.—Moved by Miss Caroline A. Biggs, seconded by Miss Beedy, M.A. :

That the cordial thanks of this meeting are hereby rendered to Mr. Forsyth, Q.C., the Right Hon. James Stansfeld, the Right Hon. the Recorder of London, and Sir Robert Anstruther, Bart., for introducing a measure to remove the electoral disabilities of women; and the meeting respectfully request them to take steps for the re-introduction of the Women's Disabilities Removal Bill at an early period of the forthcoming session, and pledge themselves to support their action by every means in their power.

Resolution IV.—Moved by Mrs. Scatcherd, seconded by Dr. Edmunds :

That the following persons be the Executive Committee for the ensuing year :—Jacob Bright, Esq., Mrs. Jacob Bright, Miss Becker, Mrs. Butler, Thomas Chorlton, Esq., Mrs. Gell, Rev. B. Glover, Mrs. Lucas, Mrs. R. R. Moore, Dr. Pankhurst, Rev. S. A. Steinthal, Mrs. Sutcliffe, Thos. Thomasson, Esq., Mrs. J. P. Thomasson, Miss Alice Wilson.

The Chair was taken by the Rev. S. Alfred Steinthal.

Resolution V.—Moved by Miss Alice Wilson, seconded by Miss Becker :

That the best thanks of the meeting be given to the Mayor of Manchester for allowing the Society the use of the Town Hall, and to Mr. Jacob Bright for presiding on the present occasion.

S. ALFRED STEINTHAL

IN ACCOUNT WITH

THE MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

£s. d.

From November 1st, 1873, to October 31st, 1874.

Dr.

To Balance	£	s.	d.	By Salaries and Office Expenditure	£	s.	d.
" Subscriptions and Donations	766	16	11	" Postage and Telegrams
" Journal	1,374	15	4	" Public Meetings
" Postage for ditto	£120	15	11	" Canvassing and Printing
" Advertisements	35	12	0	" Stationery
" Pamphlets, &c.	61	3	2	" Reporting
" Tickets at Public Meetings	217	11	1	" Office Furniture
" Interest	18	3	10	" Rent, Gas and Coal
	49	12	1	" Commission on Advertising
	6	1	2	" Pamphlets and Publications
				" Registering <i>Journal</i> and Sundries
				" Treasurer's Expenses
				" Balance
	£2,433	0	5		£2,433	0	5

Audited and found correct,

LOUIS BORCHARDT.

Manchester, December 3rd, 1874.

Liabilities...	£	s.	d.	Amounts owing to the Society	£	s.	d.
	336	13	4	
					32	4	5

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS.

FINANCIAL YEAR, 1873-1874.

A Lover of Justice	£	s.	d.
A Friend (for election expenses)	200	0	0
A Lover of Justice	100	0	0
Subscriptions per Mrs. Jacob Bright	100	0	0
A Friend	75	0	0
H. S.	25	0	0
R. L.	5	0	0
A Friend (Darlington)	2	1	0
Omega	2	0	0
R. W.	1	1	0
A Friend to Women's Suffrage (Newcastle)	1	1	0
A Lady's Derby Winnings	1	1	0
A Friend (Ripon)	1	0	0
A Friend, per Miss Jolly	0	10	6
A. A., per F. A. Trevor	0	10	0
A Friend, per Mrs. Stephenson	0	5	0
A Friend (Mrs. Brownley)	0	5	0
A Friend	0	5	0
E. T.	0	5	0
A Friend, per Miss Clark Rattray	0	3	6
A Friend	0	2	6
Anon. (Grimsby)	0	2	6
A Young Friend (Darlington)	0	2	0
A Friend (Wigan)	0	2	0
A Friend, per Mrs. Busby	0	1	0
A Lady	0	1	0
Acworth, Mrs.	2	0	0
Aldis, Professor W. S.	1	1	0
Armstrong, Miss	1	1	0
Ashworth, Mrs. J.	1	0	0
Atkinson, Mr. J.	1	0	0
Archibald, Mr. R.	0	10	6
Atkinson, Miss	0	10	0
Atkinson, Miss Maria	0	10	0
Addison, Mrs. (Preston)	0	10	0
Anthony, Miss Julia	0	10	0
Appleton, Mr. Lewis	0	10	0
Akers, Mr. H. T.	0	5	0
Alexander, Mrs.	0	5	0

Alward, Mrs. G.....	£) 5 0
Anderson, Rev. J.	0 5 0
Awde, Mr. J.	0 5 0
Ayre, Mrs. (Northallerton)	0 5 0
Atherton, Mrs.	0 2 6
Alward, Mr. G.	0 2 6
Ayre, Mr. George (Thirsk)	0 2 6
Ayre, Mrs. George (Thirsk).....	0 2 6
Ayre, Mr. T. (Northallerton)	0 2 6
Addison, Mrs. (Chathill)	0 2 0
Alward, Mr. J.	0 2 0
Brooke, Miss Edith	15 0 0
Bazley, Sir T., Bart., M.P. (1873 and 1874).....	7 0 0
Boucherett, Miss Jessie	5 0 0
Birch, Mr. W., junr.....	3 3 0
Bowring, Lady	3 0 0
Browne, Mrs. S. W.	3 0 0
Binney, Mr. E. W., F.R.S.	2 2 0
Buchan, Dowager Countess.....	2 0 0
Barlow, Mr. J.	1 1 0
Bell, Mrs. E. C. (London)	1 1 0
Bell, Mr. T. Hugh (Redcar).....	1 1 0
Bennett, Mr. W. Garnet	1 1 0
Barnes, Miss	1 0 0
Bedlington, Mr. R.	1 0 0
Biggs, Mr. Henry.....	1 0 0
Bowling, Miss L. A.	1 0 0
Bowman, Mrs. Chas.	1 0 0
Bradlaugh, Miss Alice (four years)	1 0 0
Browne, Miss (London)	1 0 0
Butler, Mrs. Josephine.....	1 0 0
Braim, Mr. Joseph.....	0 10 6
Baynes, Mrs.	0 10 0
Bellis, Mr. Joseph.....	0 10 0
Bingham, Mrs.	0 10 0
Box, Mr. A.	0 10 0
Brankston, Mrs.....	0 10 0
Bright, Mrs. Harriet (Brighton).....	0 10 0
Bramley, Mr. W. F.	0 7 6
Bell, Mr. J. D. (Darlington)	0 5 0
Bevington, Mrs.	0 5 0
Blumer, Mr. J. G.	0 5 0
Brewin, Mr. Thos.	0 5 0
Brewin, Mr. W.	0 5 0
Briant, Mr. J.	0 5 0
Bright, Mr. Thos. (Manchester).....	0 5 0
Brown, Miss M. D. (Wigan)	0 5 0
Brunton, Mr. T. P.	0 5 0
Brittain, Mrs. Thos. (two years).....	0 4 0
Brittain, Mr. W. D. (two years).....	0 4 0
Birrell, Miss	0 3 0
Baker, Mr. E. N.	0 2 6
Barker, Mrs.	0 2 6
Barralet, Mrs.	0 2 6
Bell, Mr. C. (Middlesborough).....	0 2 6
Biggs, Miss C. A.	0 2 6
Blackburn, Miss H. B.	0 2 6
Bridge, Mr. John	0 2 6
Briggs, Mr. J.	0 2 6
Brine, Mrs.....	0 2 6

Brooks, Mr. Hy.	£0 2 6
Busby, Mrs.	0 2 6
Brittain, Mr., collected by	0 2 3
Crook, Mr. Joseph.....	10 0 0
Collins, Mrs.	6 0 0
Colling, Miss E.	4 0 0
Chorlton, Mr. Thomas (1873 and 1874).....	3 3 0
Callender, Mr. W. R., M.P.....	1 1 0
Clark, Mrs. Helen Bright.....	1 1 0
Cooke, Mr. Thomas	1 1 0
Carslake, Mrs.	1 0 0
Chamberlain, Miss Caroline.....	1 0 0
Chamberlain, Miss Clara	1 0 0
Chandler, Mrs.	1 0 0
Courtauld, Mr. S.	1 0 0
Cudworth, Mr. W.	1 0 0
Crawford, Miss Sharman	1 0 0
Carlill, Mr. B.	0 10 6
Carpenter, Mrs. Russell ..	0 10 0
Coppock, Mrs.	0 10 0
Corney, Miss	0 10 0
Carter, Miss (Leicester)	0 7 6
Cholmeley, Rev. H.	0 5 6
Cheetham, Miss M. E.	0 5 0
Churchill, Miss Caroline	0 5 0
Cooper, Mr. Thos. (Wigan).....	0 5 0
Courtier, Miss	0 5 0
Crippen, Rev. T. G.	0 5 0
Calvert, Mr. J. S.	0 2 6
Clarkson, Mr. G. F.	0 2 6
Cochran, Mrs. R.	0 2 6
Crook, Miss	0 2 6
Crookall, Rev. R.	0 2 6
Carlill, Mr. J. G.	0 2 0
Cooper, Mr. (Northallerton).....	0 2 0
Chattaway, Miss	0 1 0
Collins, Mrs., collected by	1 2 0
Cliderow, Mrs.	0 1 0
Dale, Mr. Thos. (two years)	2 2 0
De la Cherois, Mrs.	1 1 0
Dewes, Rev. Alfred, D.D.	1 1 0
Debersant, Mrs.....	1 0 0
Dick, Miss	1 0 0
Dolby, Mr.	1 0 0
Dowsing, Mr.	0 10 6
Dyer, Mr.	0 10 6
Daniell, Mrs.	0 10 0
Darcy, Mrs.	0 10 0
Dixon, Mrs.	0 10 0
Donkin, Mrs.	0 10 0
Davies, Miss (Wigan)	0 5 0
Drewry, Miss Ellen	0 5 0
Drewry, Mrs. W. H.	0 5 0
Davis, Mr.	0 2 6
Dawson, Mrs. (Wigan).....	0 2 6
Devereux, Mr. C.	0 2 6
Dornan, Mr.	0 2 6
Dowson, Mr. Geo.	0 2 6

Dunkin, Miss (Southampton)	£0 2 6
Dawson, Mrs.	0 1 6
Edmondson, Mr. J.	1 1 0
Edmunds, Miss	1 1 0
Every, Mr. John	1 1 0
Emerson, Mr. Cuthbert	1 0 0
Eastwood, Mrs.	0 10 6
Elvetham, E. D. R., Mr.	0 10 6
Elam, Mr. E.	0 5 0
Ebdell, Mrs.	0 2 6
Evans, Miss M. A.	0 2 6
Emita, Mrs. Furnival	0 2 6
Ewing, Mrs.	0 2 1
Ferguson, Mrs.	1 0 0
Falconer, Mr. Thos. (<i>Journal</i>)	0 10 0
Fawcus, Mr. H. G.	0 5 0
Fisher, Mr. (West Hartlepool).....	0 5 0
Flint, Mr. F. L.	0 5 0
Fogg, Mr. J.	0 5 0
Fothergill, Mr. A.	0 5 0
Fothergill, Mr. W.	0 5 0
Fox, Miss B. J. (Ashton-in-Mackerfield)	0 5 0
Fox, Mrs. B. J. (Wigan).....	0 5 0
Freeston, Rev. J.	0 5 0
Freeston, Mrs.	0 5 0
Frost, Mr. Alfred	0 5 0
Fuller, Mrs.	0 5 0
Furness, Mr. Thos.	0 5 0
Foggett, Mr. W.	0 3 0
Fairburn, Mr. Joseph	0 2 6
Fairburn, Mrs.	0 2 6
Fisher, Mr. S. G. (Darlington)	0 2 6
Fox, Mrs. (Ripon)	0 2 6
Goldschmidt, Mr. P. (1873 and 1874)	10 0 0
Gell, Mrs.	5 0 0
Gaddum, Mrs. (two years)	4 0 0
Grey, Mrs. Wm.....	2 2 0
Garton, Mrs.	1 1 0
Gregory, Mrs. Makdougall	1 1 0
Gwynne, Mrs.	1 1 0
Grece, Mr. Clair J.....	1 0 0
Gwenhiddim, H. Taythes Morganwg	1 0 0
Gasquoine, Rev. T.	0 10 6
Gregson, Mr. Thos.	0 10 6
Gammage, Dr.	0 10 0
Gatenby, Mrs.	0 10 0
Gay, Mrs.	0 10 0
Grece, Mrs. Susanna.....	0 10 0
Gibson, Mr.	0 10 0
Gee, Mr. J.	0 5 0
Gerard, Miss H. C.	0 5 0
Gibbs, Mr. G. S.....	0 5 0
Glendinning, Mr. H. R.	0 5 0
Gooch, Miss Jane	0 5 0
Gregson, Mrs. S. G.	0 5 0
Griffiths, Mrs. Thos.....	0 5 0
Grundy, Mr. J.	0 5 0

Guthrie, Mr. James	£0 5 0
Glover, Mr. John (Hull)	0 4 0
Garnett, Mrs.	0 2 6
Gibbon, Mr. W.	0 2 6
Gidley, Mr.....	0 2 6
Gurney, Miss Amy	0 2 6
Guthrie, Mrs.....	0 2 6
Haslam, Mrs. W. (Bolton)	10 0 0
Hargreaves, Mr. W.	5 0 0
Holland, Mrs. Charles	5 0 0
Hall, Miss Rose A.	2 2 0
Hanrott, Mrs. P. A.	2 2 0
Hunter, Mrs. Stephenson.....	2 2 0
Hervey, Miss Rosamond	2 0 0
Heywood, Mrs. Abel.....	2 0 0
Hodgson, Dr. W. B.	2 0 0
Humble, Miss.....	2 0 0
Hetherington, Mrs.	1 3 6
Hamilton, Mrs., of Sundrum	1 1 0
Harrison, Mrs. Henry	1 1 0
Haworth, Mr. Abraham	1 1 0
Hutchinson, Miss R. P.	1 1 0
Hunter, Mrs. Stephenson	1 1 0
Harris, Mr. Henry	1 0 0
Hart, Mr. H. G.....	1 0 0
Haydn, Miss Ellen.....	1 0 0
Head, Mr. Jeremiah	1 0 0
Holdsworth, Mrs.	0 12 0
Hardwick, Miss.....	0 10 0
Haddock, Mrs.	0 5 0
Hampson, Mr.	0 5 0
Hampson, Mrs.	0 5 0
Harcastle, Mr. F.	0 5 0
Harding, Mr. W.	0 5 0
Hare, Mr. Samuel.....	0 5 0
Haslam, Mrs. W. (Tonbridge)	0 5 0
Hawker, Miss N.	0 5 0
Hedley, Mr. A.	0 5 0
Hickes, Miss Frances	0 5 0
Hindle, Mrs.	0 5 0
Hill, Mr. James (Blue Pits)	0 5 0
Hope, Mr. R. (deceased)	0 5 0
Horner, Mrs.	0 5 0
Hume-Rothery, Mrs.....	0 5 0
Husband, Mr. R.	0 5 0
Hutchence, Mr. W. A.....	0 5 0
Hall, Mr. J. W.....	0 2 6
Hall, Mrs. J. W.	0 2 6
Haller, Mr. Thos.	0 2 6
Halliday, Mrs.	0 2 6
Hargreaves, Miss (Burnley)	0 2 6
Hearne, Mrs. (<i>Journal</i>)	0 2 6
Hetherington, Mrs.	0 2 6
Hebden, Mrs.	0 2 6
Hill, Mr. G. H.	0 2 6
Hodgson, Mr. C.	0 2 6
Hooper, Mr. Nelson	0 2 6
Hopps, Rev. J. Page.....	0 2 6
Howden, Mr.	0 2 6
Howe, Mrs.....	0 2 6

Huntsman, Mrs.	£) 2 6
Hutchinson, Mr. Ed.	0 2 6
Hawke, Mr. J. O.	0 2 0
Hill, Miss S.	0 2 0
Hodkinson, Mrs.	0 2 0
Huntrod, Mr.	0 1 0
Ireland, Mr. A.	1 1 0
Ianson, Mrs.	0 5 0
Jennings, Mr. J. (Middlesbrough)	0 10 6
Jacques, Mr. (Wigan)	0 10 0
Johnson, Miss M.	0 10 0
Jordison, Mr. J.	0 10 0
Joy, Mrs.	0 10 0
Jeffs, Mr. C.	0 5 0
Jones, Mrs. Mary (Wigan)	0 5 0
Jones, Miss E. (Weare Gifford)	0 4 0
Jenkins, Captain	0 3 0
Jacob, Miss.	0 2 6
Jacques, Mr. (Thirsk)	0 2 6
Jeffs, Mr. Geo.	0 2 6
Johnson, Mr. J.	0 2 6
Jennings, Mr. W. (Bristol)	0 2 6
Jesper, Miss Anna ..	0 2 0
Jebb, Mrs.	0 2 0
King, Mrs. E. M.	2 2 0
Kellett, Mrs. E.	1 0 0
Kitching, Mrs.	1 0 0
Knott, Miss.	1 0 0
Kenderdine, Mrs.	0 10 0
Kilmister, Mrs. ..	0 5 0
Kitchener, Mr. F. E.	0 5 0
Kitchener, Mrs. F. E.	0 5 0
Kelly, Mr. Henry	0 2 6
Langton, Lady Anna Gore	21 0 0
Lytton, The Dowager Lady	5 0 0
Long, Mrs.	4 0 0
Lightbown, Mr. Henry	3 3 0
Lawson, Mr. W. (two years)	2 2 0
Lee, Mr. William (Prestwich) ..	2 2 0
Lowndes, Miss Mary	1 11 6
Lister, Mrs.	1 1 0
Lucas, Mrs.	1 1 0
Lawson, Sir W., Bart., M.P.	1 0 0
Lockwood, Lady Julia	1 0 0
Lee, Mr. G. (Ardwick) ..	0 10
Longstaff, Mr. G. B.	0 10 6
Layton, Mrs.	0 10 0
Lea, Mrs. E.	0 10 0
Leaf, Miss Julia	0 10 0
Le Blanc, Mr.	0 10 0
Leech, Mrs. (two years)	0 10 0
Leighton, Mr. A.	0 10 0
Liddell, Hon. Mrs. Thos.	0 10 0
Lascaridi, Mr. P. T.	0 5 0
Latham, Dr. John	0 5 0

Lee, Mr. S. B. (Ripon) ..	£0 5 0
Livens, Mrs.	0 5 0
Lloyd, Mr. John	0 5 0
Lupton, Miss H.	0 5 0
Lyon, Mr. J. A.	0 5 0
Lambert, Rev. Brooke	0 3 6
Lohner, Mad. Emilie	0 2 6
Lowe, Mr. E.	0 2 6
Mason, Mr. Hugh	10 10 0
Mather, Mr. W.	2 2 0
Marshall, Mr. S.	1 10 0
M'Kerrow, Rev. Dr., 1873 and 1874 ..	2 1 0
M'Kerrow, Mr. J. B.	1 1 0
Maden, Mr. H.	1 1 0
Marsden, Mr. James (Wigan) ..	1 1 0
Measham, Mr. H.	1 1 0
Moorhouse, Miss Annie	1 1 0
Morrell, Mr. J.	1 1 0
McCulloch, Mrs.	1 0 0
McKinnel, Mrs.	1 0 0
Marsden, Mr. John (Manchester) ..	1 0 0
Melling, Mr. W.	1 0 0
Milne, Mr. J. D.	1 0 0
Muir, Mrs.	1 0 0
Muirhead, Dr.	1 0 0
Malam, Mr.	0 10 0
Marshall, Mr. F. E.	0 10 0
Medley, Mrs. (York) ..	0 10 0
Melling, Miss.	0 10 0
Moore, Mrs.	0 10 0
Mottram, Mr. R. E.	0 10 0
Muller, Mr. C. E.	0 10 0
Medley, Mr. E. (York) ..	0 5 0
Mackie, Misses	0 5 0
Massey, Mrs.	0 5 0
Maw, Mr. N.	0 5 0
Meeke, Mrs.	0 5 0
Miall, Miss S. F.	0 5 0
Middleton, Mr. R. M.	0 5 0
Mudd, Mr.	0 5 0
Mudd, Mr. H.	0 5 0
Mylne, Mrs.	0 5 0
Melhuish, Mr.	0 2 6
Mellor, Mr. B. (Huddersfield) ..	0 2 6
McDermid, Mr. C.	0 2 6
Micks, Mr. R.	0 2 6
Milner, Mrs.	0 2 6
Moody, Mr.	0 2 6
Mount, Mr. Jos.	0 2 6
Morris, Mrs.	0 2 6
M'Kerrow, Mrs. (Southport) ..	0 2 0
Mudd, Mr. Simeon ..	0 2 0
Martin, Miss	0 1 0
Mills, Mrs., collected by	1 5 0
McKinnel, Mrs., collected by ..	0 5 0
Nicol, Mr. H.	1 11 6
Newman, Prof. F. W.	1 1 0
Nichol, Miss (Oxford) ..	0 10 0

Nicol, Miss Louisa (London)	£0 10 0
Nicholson, Miss (Bourton-on-the-Hill)	0 5 0
Nicol, Miss Janet (West Hartlepool)	0 5 0
Newsam, Mr. H.	0 2 6
Ogden, Mrs.	5 0 0
Ord, Mrs.	1 0 0
Owen, Mr. W. R.	0 10 0
Outhwaite, Mr. Thos.	0 5 0
Owen, Mrs. Jane (Conway)	0 5 0
Oxley, the Misses	0 5 0
Oldham, Mrs.	0 3 6
Praed, Miss Elizabeth Lillian Mackworth	117 0 0
Pease, Mr. Arthur	10 0 0
Pease, Mrs. Gurney	5 0 0
Pease, Mrs. J. Bowman	3 0 0
Pankhurst, Dr. (1873 and 1874)	2 2 0
Peck, Mr. Francis	2 2 0
Pochin, Mrs.	2 2 0
Pease, Mrs. Fell	2 0 0
Price, Dr. W. (1873 and 1874)	2 0 0
Palmer, Mr. J. Hinde	1 1 0
Peiser, Mr. J.	1 1 0
Potter, Mr. T. B., M.P.	1 1 0
Pease, Mrs. E. L.	1 0 0
Parker, Mr. Wm. Coor	0 10 0
Pung, Miss S. A.	0 10 0
Pyman, Mr. G.	0 10 0
Prideaux, Miss (Brighton)	0 7 6
Paterson, Mr. J.	0 5 0
Peachey, Mr. W.	0 5 0
Plimsaul, Mrs.	0 5 0
Porter, Miss (London)	0 5 0
Porter, Mr. A. (Salford)	0 5 0
Proctor, Miss H. E.	0 5 0
Park, Miss Agnes	0 2 6
Paterson, Mr.	0 2 6
Peacock, Mrs.	0 2 6
Prideaux, Miss (Darlington)	0 2 6
Purcell, Miss H.	0 2 6
Pearce, Mr. G.	0 1 0
Pilkington, Mrs., collected by	3 10 0
Rigbye, Miss Harriette	10 0 0
Ramsbottom, Miss	1 1 0
Rhys, Mrs.	1 1 0
Roberts, Mr. J. F. (Manchester)	1 0 0
Robinson, Mrs. (Manchester)	1 0 0
Ryley, Mrs.	1 0 0
Roberts, Mr. J. L. (Holloway)	0 10 6
Roberts, Mrs. (Pwlheli)	0 10 0
Ross, Mr. John	0 10 0
Raven, Mr. Geo.	0 5 0
Rawson, Mr. P. L.	0 5 0
Rhoades, Mr. J.	0 5 0
Ridgway, Mr. M.	0 5 0
Ready, Mr. T. W.	0 3 0
Robinson, Mr. (Hull)	0 2 6
Rawson, Mr. James	6 2 0
Samuelson, Mr. H. B.	5 5 0

Steinthal, Mr. H. M.	£5 0 0
Steinthal, Rev. S. Alfred	5 0 0
Scholefield, Mrs.	2 2 0
Samelson, Dr. (1873 and 1874)	2 0 0
Samuelson, Mr. James	1 1 0
Sargent, Miss	1 1 0
Shore, Miss A. S.	1 1 0
Stephens, Mr. H. C.	1 1 0
Stephenson, Mr. R. (Middlesbrough)	1 1 0
Stuart, Mr. James (Cambridge)	1 1 0
Sharman, Mrs. N. Pearce	1 0 0
Shepherd, Miss E. C.	1 0 0
Skerry, Mrs.	1 0 0
Smith, Mrs. G. H. (Highbury)	1 0 0
Steains, Mr. Arthur	1 0 0
Smith, Mrs. W. B. (Birmingham)	0 10 6
Stuart, Mr. James (Hull)	0 10 6
Scott, Mrs. Eliz. R. (London)	0 10 0
Sherman, Mr. (San Francisco)	0 10 0
Shields, Mrs. W.	0 10 0
Smallpage, Mrs.	0 10 0
Smarey, Miss	0 10 0
Smith, Misses S. and H. (Middlesbrough)	0 10 0
Stephenson, Mrs. (Nottingham)	0 10 0
Stuart, Miss	0 10 0
Steains, Mr. A. (<i>Journal</i>)	0 10 0
Senior, Mr. George	0 7 6
Scott, Mrs. (Cheltenham)	0 5 0
Severs, Mrs. G.	0 5 0
Severs, Mr. John	0 5 0
Shawson, Mr.	0 5 0
Shewell, Mr. J. S.	0 5 0
Simmons, Miss Agnes	0 5 0
Sleight, Mr. J. F.	0 5 0
Smethurst, Mr., sen.	0 5 0
Smethurst, Mr., jun.	0 5 0
Smith, Mrs. (Kettering)	0 5 0
Smith, Rev. J. H. (Dewsbury)	0 5 0
Smith, Mrs. Alfred (Ripon)	0 5 0
Smith, Mr. B. (Thirsk)	0 5 0
Spence, Miss Sarah A.	0 5 0
Stainsby, Mr. J.	0 5 0
Stephenson, Mr. (Grimsby)	0 5 0
Stratten, Mr.	0 5 0
Sutcliffe, Mrs. S. B.	0 5 0
Sutcliffe, Mr. R.	0 5 0
Sutcliffe, Mrs. R.	0 5 0
Saunders, Mrs. J.	0 2 6
Sinclair, Mr. R.	0 2 6
Slatter, Mrs. J.	0 2 6
Smith, Mr. R. (Grimsby)	0 2 6
Sparkes, Mr. J. M.	0 2 6
Stroyan, Mrs.	0 2 6
Saunby, Mr.	0 2 0
Snow, Mrs.	0 2 0
Starling, Mr.	0 2 0
Shepperd, Miss L. S. (Halifax)	0 1 6
Simpson, Mrs.	0 1 0
Smith, Mrs. (Carlisle)	0 1 0
Snowdon, Mrs.	0 1 0
Collected by Mrs. Geo. Sims	0 10 0

Thomasson, Mr.....	£130	0	0
Thomasson, Mr. and Mrs. J. P.	100	0	0
Todd, Mrs. (Chester)	10	0	0
Todd, Miss L. (Chester)	5	0	0
Todd, Miss E. A. (Chester).....	5	0	0
Trevelyan, Mr. A. (two years)	4	0	0
Taylor, Mrs. Henry	1	1	0
Taylor, Mrs. Thomas	1	1	0
Tennent, Lady Emerson	1	1	0
Townsend, Mr. M.P.....	1	1	0
Tewson, Mrs.....	1	0	0
Thomson, Miss Dora.....	1	0	0
Turner, Mr. J. Fox	1	0	0
Taylor, Mr. W.	0	10	6
Tennent, Miss Maria.....	0	10	6
Thelwall, Mr. John	0	10	6
Twigg, Mrs. G.	0	10	6
Thompson, Mr. Charles (Middlesbrough).....	0	10	0
Trevor, Miss Frances A.	0	7	6
Tattersall, Mrs.	0	5	0
Taylor, Mrs. M. (Wigan)	0	5	0
Thomas, Miss R.	0	5	0
Tootal, Miss	0	5	0
Trevor, Miss H. M.	0	5	0
Trevor, E. R. S.	0	4	6
Thorpe, Mr.	0	3	0
Tongue, Mr. Barnabas.....	0	2	6
Thomas, Miss R.	0	2	6
Thomas, Mrs. W.	0	2	6
Todd, Mrs. (Leeds)	0	2	6
Tweedie, Mrs.	0	2	6
Thompson, Mr. W. (Ripon).....	0	2	0
Thompson, Mrs. W. (").....	0	2	0
Thorburn, Miss Jenny.....	0	2	0
Trevor, Miss Mary	0	2	0
Virey, Miss	0	7	0
Wood, Mr. and Mrs. W. Thorold (Lisbon)	10	0	0
Winkworth, Mrs.	7	0	0
Whitehead, Mrs. (two years)	2	0	0
Walker, Mr. J. W.	1	1	0
Waters, Mr. T. B.	1	1	0
Walker, Mr. (Manchester)	1	1	0
Williams, Mr. (Middlesbrough)	1	1	0
Williams, Mr. Philip (Aberystwith)	1	1	0
Winder, Mrs. Robert	1	1	0
Weiss, Mrs.....	1	0	0
Wood, Mrs. Travers (Swansea).....	1	0	0
Wintringham, Mr. J.	0	10	6
Worthington, Mr. Thos.	0	10	6
Walton, Mrs.....	0	10	0
Walton, Miss	0	10	0
Watson, Miss Julia	0	10	0
Watts, Mrs. Alfred (two years)	0	10	0
Whitelegge, Miss (two years).....	0	10	0
Williams, Mrs. (Salford)	0	10	0
Wilson, Mr. and Mrs. H. J. (Sheffield)	0	10	0
Walker, Mr. S. (Hull)	0	5	0
Webb, Mr. A.....	0	5	0
Wilson, Miss A. (Manchester).....	0	5	0

Wilson, Mr. C. (Garstang)	£0	5	0
Witty, Mr. Thos.	0	5	0
Woodhead, Mrs. (Manchester)	0	5	0
Woodhead, Miss Lucy (Manchester)	0	5	0
Woodhead, Mr. H. (Manchester).....	0	5	0
Worthington, Rev. A. W.	0	5	0
Wright, Mr. L. (Middlesbrough)	0	5	0
Wright, Miss L. (Darlington).....	0	3	0
Wayham, Mrs.	0	2	6
Walker, Mrs. (Ripon).....	0	2	6
Webster, Mr. Joseph.....	0	2	6
Whitwell, Mr. C. W.....	0	2	6
Woodhead, Mrs. (Leeds)	0	2	6
Wade, Miss.....	0	2	0
Wake, Mr. J.	0	2	0
Wenney, Mr.	0	2	0
Wheeler, Mrs.....	0	2	0
Wigan Committee	4	10	0
Yates, Mrs. R. V.	2	0	0
Yeadley, Mr.	0	2	6



MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR
WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

RULES.

I. The object of the Society is, to obtain for Women the right of voting for Members of Parliament on the same conditions as it is, or may be, granted to men.

II. Approval of the object of the Society, and an annual subscription of any amount shall constitute membership.

III. The subscriptions are due on the first day of January for the current year.

IV. An Executive Committee shall be appointed at an Annual General Meeting, which committee shall have power to add to its number.

V. The committee, at its first meeting subsequent to the Annual Meeting, shall appoint a secretary and a treasurer.

VI. A General Meeting of the Society shall be held once a year to receive the report, the statement of accounts, to appoint the committee, and transact any other business which may arise.

VII. A Special General Meeting of the Society may be called at any time by the committee, and, at the written request of twenty-five Members, the secretary shall call a Special Meeting. At such meeting no subjects shall be discussed but those mentioned in the notice summoning the members.

VIII. No General Meeting of the Society shall be called without eight days' public notice of such meeting.

IX. These rules shall not be altered except at a General Meeting; and no rule shall be altered at any meeting unless a month's notice of such proposed alteration has been given to the committee.

MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S
SUFFRAGE.

Members of the Society and others are earnestly requested to aid the movement for procuring the passing of the Bill to remove the electoral disabilities of women.

I. By collecting signatures to the petition, forms of which may be obtained from the Secretary.

II. By bringing the question under the notice of Members of Parliament, whenever they appear before their constituents.

III. Should notice of any motion, friendly or hostile, be given in the House of Commons—by writing letters, asking the local Members to support the principle of Women's Suffrage.

IV. In case of an election, by calling on every candidate to declare whether he will, if returned, vote for the Bill to remove the electoral disabilities of women.

V. By trying to procure insertions of facts and arguments bearing on the question, in the local press.

VI. By communicating to the Secretary any information likely to be useful to the Society, and the names of such persons as may be disposed to assist the cause.

VII. Where there are three or four members in the same place, by uniting to form a local committee.

VIII. By endeavouring to increase the number of members.

IX. By promoting the circulation of the Women's Suffrage Journal.

X. By extending the organization of the Society through the medium of corresponding members or local committees. All persons willing to render such assistance are earnestly requested to communicate with the Secretary.

Further information will be willingly afforded to all who may desire it.

LYDIA E. BECKER, SECRETARY,
28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

The petitions marked ¶ have the addresses of some or all of the petitioners affixed.
The petitions marked S are signed officially.

WOMEN'S DISABILITIES BILL.—IN FAVOUR.

¶ Mar. 20.	Inhabitants of BUCKHAVEN, in the county of Fife, in public meeting assembled; James C. Hunter, chairman (<i>Sir Robt. Anstruther</i>)	1
¶ —	WEST WEMYS, in the county of Fife, in public meeting assembled; M. Wilson, chairman (<i>Sir Robert Anstruther</i>)	1
¶ —	BRIGHTON (<i>Mr. Ashbury</i>)	35
¶ —	Women of MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Birley</i>)	1,287
¶ —	Inhabitants of MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Birley</i>)	1,050
¶ —	— (<i>Mr. Callender</i>)	1,225
¶ —	Women of MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Callender</i>)	1,096
¶ —	Inhabitants of LEEDS (<i>Mr. Carter</i>)	296
¶ —	LEEDS, in public meeting assembled; Houghton, chairman (<i>Mr. Carter</i>)	1
¶ —	Women of HUNSLLET, in public meeting assembled; Alice Scatcherd, chairwoman (<i>Mr. Carter</i>)	1
¶ —	SALFORD (<i>Mr. Cawley</i>)	1,059
¶ —	Inhabitants of SALFORD (<i>Mr. Cawley</i>)	525
¶ —	LEWES, in public meeting assembled; (<i>Name illegible</i>) chairman (<i>Mr. Christie</i>)	1
¶ —	BUCKIE, in the county of Banff, in public meeting assembled; George G. Green, M.A., chairman (<i>Mr. Robert Duff</i>)	1
¶ —	MARYLEBONE (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	4,126
¶ —	BATH (<i>Captain Hayter</i>)	491
¶ —	¶ NOTTINGHAM, in public meeting assembled; Joseph S. Gilpin, chairman (<i>Mr. Isaac</i>)	1
¶ —	BIRKENHEAD, in public meeting assembled; C. Holland, chairwoman (<i>Mr. Laird</i>)	1
¶ —	LAMBETH (<i>Sir James Lawrence</i>)	2,556
¶ —	LEITH, in public meeting assembled; Wm. Lindsay, chairman (<i>Mr. Macgregor</i>)	1
¶ —	WEST WICKHAM (<i>Sir Charles Henry Mills</i>)	70
¶ —	Saint James, BRISTOL (<i>Mr. Morley</i>)	180
¶ —	GOUROCK, in public meeting assembled; David Macrae, chairman (<i>Col. Mure</i>)	1
¶ —	WESTMINSTER (<i>Sir Charles Russell</i>)	133
¶ —	BURMANTOFTS, Leeds, in public meeting assembled; Ann Thoysse, chairwoman (<i>Mr. Tennant</i>)	1

¶ Mar. 20.	Inhabitants of FINSBURY (<i>Mr. Torrens</i>)	1,862
¶ —	— ¶ ASHTON, in the county of Lancaster (<i>Mr. Turner</i>)	33
¶ —	— ARMLEY, in public meeting assembled; Jane Burmestone, chairwoman (<i>Mr. Wheelhouse</i>)	1
¶ —	— LEEDS, in public meeting assembled; Alice Scatcherd, chairwoman (<i>Mr. Wheelhouse</i>)	1
¶ —	21. — WATERFORD (<i>Lord Charles Beresford</i>)	78
¶ —	— (<i>Lord Charles Beresford</i>)	48
¶ —	— BROMLEY (<i>Lord Charles Beresford</i>)	44
¶ —	— SALFORD (<i>Mr. Charley</i>)	1,286
¶ —	— (<i>Mr. Charley</i>)	584
¶ —	— ARDROSSAN, in the county of Ayr, in public meeting assembled; J. L. Bailey, chairman (<i>Mr. Montgomerie</i>)	1
¶ —	23. — BANCHORY, in public meeting assembled; Richard M. Dow, chairman (<i>Sir George Dalfour</i>)	1
¶ —	— MANCHESTER (<i>Sir Thomas Bazley</i>)	1,044
¶ —	Women of MANCHESTER (<i>Sir Thomas Bazley</i>)	1,238
¶ —	— (<i>Sir Thomas Bazley</i>)	1,020
¶ —	Inhabitants of MANCHESTER, in public meeting assembled; Jacob Bright, chairman (<i>Sir Thomas Bazley</i>)	1
¶ —	— BREDBURY and ROMILY (<i>Mr. Cumbliffe Brooks</i>)	49
¶ —	— MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Callender</i>)	1,262
¶ —	Women of SALFORD (<i>Mr. Charley</i>)	694
¶ —	Inhabitants of NEWHAVEN (<i>Earl of Dalkeith</i>)	255
¶ —	— CHELSEA (<i>Sir Charles Dilke</i>)	2,350
¶ —	— BRISTOL (<i>Mr. Kirkman Hodgson</i>)	209
¶ —	— LERWICK, in public meeting assembled; Wm. Duncan, chairman (<i>Mr. Laing</i>)	1
¶ —	— STORNAWAY, Lewis, in public meeting assembled; Charles M'Ewing, chairman (<i>Marquis of Lorne</i>)	1
¶ —	— FORRES, in public meeting assembled; W. M. McDonald, chairman (<i>Mr. Mackintosh</i>)	1
¶ —	— PEEBLES (<i>Sir Graham Montgomery</i>)	236
¶ —	— KIRKWALL, in public meeting assembled; Donald Morgan, chairman (<i>Mr. Pender</i>)	1
¶ —	— HALIFAX, in public meeting assembled; Ellen Wood, chairwoman (<i>Mr. Stanfeld</i>)	1
¶ —	24. — MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Birley</i>)	1,010
¶ —	Women of MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Birley</i>)	1,057
¶ —	Inhabitants of NORTH WOOLWICH (<i>Mr. Boord</i>)	406
¶ —	— WOOLWICH (<i>Mr. Boord</i>)	636
¶ —	— BATH (<i>Major Bousfield</i>)	382
¶ —	— (<i>Major Bousfield</i>)	311
¶ —	— (<i>Major Bousfield</i>)	362
¶ —	Women of MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Callender</i>)	1,355

28	Mar. 24. Inhabitants of GRANTOWN, in public meeting assembled; R. B. Wallace, chairman (<i>Mr. Donald Cameron</i>)	1
28	— Women of HOLBECK, in public meeting assembled; Dinah Goodall, chairwoman (<i>Mr. Carter</i>)	1
28	— Inhabitants of PETERHEAD, in public meeting assembled; John Anderson, chairman (<i>Mr. Grant Duff</i>)... ..	1
28	— BANFF, in public meeting assembled; George Shearer, chairman (<i>Mr. Grant Duff</i>)	1
28	— LENNOXTOWN, in the county of Stirling (<i>Admiral Edmonstone</i>)	110
28	— INSCH, in the county of Aberdeen, in public meeting assembled; Alexander Roger, chairman (<i>Mr. Fordyce</i>)	1
28	— KEMNAY, in the county of Aberdeen, in public meeting assembled; William Still, chairman (<i>Mr. Fordyce</i>)	1
28	— CUMINESTOWN, in public meeting assembled; James Cowie, chairman (<i>Mr. Fordyce</i>)	1
28	— HUNTLEY, in public meeting assembled; James Watt, chairman (<i>Mr. Fordyce</i>)	1
28	— MARYLEBONE (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	511
28	— Women of MARYLEBONE (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	506
28	— Inhabitants of PLUMSTEAD (<i>Mr. William Ewart Gladstone</i>)	676
28	— WOOLWICH (<i>Mr. William Ewart Gladstone</i>)	626
28	— ACTON, in public meeting assembled; H. Hunter, chairman (<i>Lord G. Hamilton</i>)	1
28	— PORT GLASGOW, in public meeting assembled; Alexander Lang, chairman (<i>Mr. John Harrison</i>)	1
28	— RENFREW, in public meeting assembled; James Glen, chairman (<i>Mr. John Harrison</i>)	1
28	— BALA (<i>Mr. Holland</i>)	48
28	— PORTROSE, in public meeting assembled; Kenneth Mackenzie, chairman (<i>Mr. Mackintosh</i>)	1
28	— LEICESTER (<i>Mr. Alexander M'Arthur</i>)	99
28	— Members of the STRATHLEVEN Lodge of Good Templars; W. Anderson, worthy chief templar (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	1
28	— Inhabitants of EDINBURGH, in public meeting assembled; J. Millar, chairman (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	1
28	— EDINBURGH, in public meeting assembled; James Buchanan, chairman (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	1
28	— James Marshall, chairman (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	1
28	— (<i>Name illegible</i>), chairman (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	1
28	— WEST LINTON, in public meeting assembled; John Alexander, chairman (<i>Sir George Montgomery</i>)	1

28	Mar. 24. Inhabitants of CLIFTON (<i>Mr. Morley</i>)... ..	102
28	— LEICESTER (<i>Mr. Pell</i>)	24
28	— WESTMINSTER (<i>Mr. William Smith</i>)	1,324
28	— BECKENHAM (<i>Mr. John Talbot</i>)	56
28	— LEICESTER (<i>Mr. Peter Taylor</i>)	50
28	— LEICESTER, in public meeting assembled; A. A. Isaacs, chairman (<i>Mr. Peter Taylor</i>)... ..	1
28	— MAIDENHEAD (<i>Mr. Walter</i>)	217
28	— — (<i>Mr. Walter</i>)	201
28	— BARRHEAD	346
28	— NEW DEER, in public meeting assembled; Alexander Carter, chairman	1
28	20. — WESTMINSTER (<i>Sir Charles Russell</i>)	1,335
28	25. Women of MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Callender</i>)	1,086
28	— Inhabitants of CANTERBURY (<i>Mr. Majendie</i>)	55
28	— MALDON, in public meeting assembled; H. Sprague, chairman (<i>Mr. Sandford</i>)	1
28	— Women of PERTH... ..	91
28	26. — CHEETHAM, Manchester (<i>Sir Thos. Bazley</i>)	552
28	— — — (<i>Sir Thos. Bazley</i>)	512
28	— — — (<i>Sir Thos. Bazley</i>)	1,193
28	— Inhabitants of SOUTHWARK (<i>Colonel Beresford</i>)	1,449
28	— MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Callender</i>)	785
28	— CHEELMSFORD, in public meeting assembled; F. Copland, chairman (<i>Lord Edward Cecil</i>)	1
28	— EDINBURGH (<i>Mr. Cowan</i>)	426
28	— PORTSMOUTH, in public meeting assembled; Major-General G. G. Alexander, chairman (<i>Sir James Elphinstone</i>)... ..	1
28	— Members of the Congregation of the Unitarian Chapel, MERTHYR TYDFIL (<i>Mr. Fothergill</i>)	27
28	— Inhabitants of GREENLAW, in public meeting assembled; Robert Gibson, chairman (<i>Mr. Baillie Hamilton</i>)	1
28	27. — TIVERTON, in public meeting assembled; R. F. Loosemore, chairman (<i>Sir John Heathcoat Amory</i>)	1
28	— ALDERSHOT (<i>Mr. Beach</i>)	31
28	— Ardwick Ward, MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Birley</i>)	513
28	— Women of MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Birley</i>)... ..	1,173
28	— Inhabitants of GLASGOW, in public meeting assembled; Kenneth Mathieson, chairman (<i>Mr. Donald Cameron</i>)	1
28	— ABINGDON, in public meeting assembled; Edward Harris, chairman (<i>Mr. Clarke</i>)	1
28	— EDINBURGH (<i>Mr. Cowan</i>)	109
28	— MARY BURTON, Liberton Bank (<i>Earl of Dalkeith</i>)	1
28	— Inhabitants of GROOMBRIDGE, in the county of Kent (<i>Viscount Holmesdale</i>)	38
28	— SOUTHBOROUGH, in the county of Kent (<i>Viscount Holmesdale</i>)... ..	121
28	— — — (<i>Viscount Holmesdale</i>)	46
28	— TUNBRIDGE, in the county of Kent (<i>Viscount Holmesdale</i>)	40

	Mar. 27. Inhabitants of LANGTON, in the county of Kent (<i>Viscount Holmesdale</i>)... ..	17
—	LEITH (<i>Mr. Macgregor</i>)	513
—	EDINBURGH, in public meeting assembled; Hugh Rose, chairman (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	1
—	EDINBURGH, in public meeting assembled; Priscilla M'Laren, president (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	1
—	WREXFHAM, in the county of Denbigh, in public meeting assembled; W. H. Darby, chairman (<i>Mr. Osborne Morgan</i>)	1
—	ARDROSSAN, in the County of Ayr (<i>Mr. Montgomerie</i>)	78
—	AIRDRIE, in public meeting assembled; James C. Adamson, chairman (<i>Mr. Ramsay</i>)	1
—	BRIGHTON (<i>General Shute</i>)... ..	1,678
—	LEEDS... ..	286
28. —	TUNBRIDGE WELLS (<i>Mr. Dyke</i>)	196
—	— (<i>Mr. Dyke</i>)	458
30. —	Women of SALFORD (<i>Mr. Charley</i>)	547
—	Inhabitants of SALFORD (<i>Mr. Charley</i>)	517
—	— (<i>Mr. Charley</i>)	525
—	NEATH (<i>Mr. Dillwyn</i>)	101
—	CHINNOR (<i>Mr. Henley</i>)	39
—	COLCHESTER, in public meeting assembled; (<i>Name illegible</i>), chairman (<i>Mr. Learmouth</i>)	1
—	EDINBURGH (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	985
—	CRIEFF (<i>Sir William Maxwell</i>)	229
—	COMRIE (<i>Sir William Maxwell</i>)	117
—	Members of the Royal Oak of Stathearn Lodge (No. 611) of the Independent Order of Good Templars, COMRIE; David Miller, worthy chief templar (<i>Sir William Maxwell</i>)	3
—	Inhabitants of GOVAN (<i>Colonel Mure</i>)	355
—	NEILSTON (<i>Colonel Mure</i>)	376
31. —	CHIRNSIDE, in public meeting assembled; Robert McKimmie, chairman (<i>Mr. Baillie Hamilton</i>)	1
—	BRISTOL (<i>Mr. Kirkman Hodgson</i>)... ..	3,540
—	DUNKELD (<i>Sir William Maxwell</i>)... ..	64
April 13. —	BROMLEY (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	101
—	CORSTON (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	159
—	BECKENHAM and BROMLEY, in the county of Kent (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	50
—	DUMBARTON, in public meeting assembled; Samuel Bennett, chairman (<i>Mr. John Harrison</i>)	1
—	AMLWCH, in public meeting assembled; Henry Lloyd, chairman (<i>Mr. Morgan Lloyd</i>)	1
—	POLLOKSHAW, in public meeting as- sembled; Walter Paterson, chairman (<i>Colonel Mure</i>)	1

April 13. Inhabitants of GOUROCK, in the county of	Renfrew (<i>Colonel Mure</i>)	219
—	LEICESTER (<i>Mr. Pell</i>)	50
—	TAIN, in public meeting assembled; Thos. Grant, chairman (<i>Mr. Pender</i>)	1
—	HALSTEAD (<i>Mr. Round</i>)	48
—	LEICESTER (<i>Mr. Peter Taylor</i>)	464
—	— (<i>Mr. Peter Taylor</i>)	125
—	GALASHIELS, in public meeting assembled; T. Messer, chairman (<i>Mr. Trevelyan</i>)	1
14. —	BURNTISLAND, in public meeting assembled; David Low, chairman (<i>Sir Robert Anstruther</i>)	1
—	LEEDS (<i>Mr. Carter</i>)... ..	383
—	— (<i>Mr. Carter</i>)... ..	223
—	CHELSEA, in public meeting assembled; Frederick H. A. Hardcastle, chairman (<i>Sir Charles Dilke</i>)	1
—	SALTFORD (<i>Captain Hayter</i>)	96
—	ASHTON-UNDER-LYNE (<i>Mr. Mellor</i>)	1,566
—	INNERLEITHEN, in public meeting as- sembled; Alexander Lennie, chair- man (<i>Sir George Montgomery</i>)	1
—	TRANENT (<i>Sir Henry Pelly</i>)	64
—	EAST LINTON (<i>Sir Henry Pelly</i>)	68
—	BELFAST (<i>Dr. Smyth</i>)	50
—	OLDHAM, in public meeting assembled; E. Whittaker, mayor, chairman, (<i>Mr. Serjeant Spinks</i>)	1
—	SHELLY (<i>Mr. Spencer Stanhope</i>)	48
—	COWBRIDGE, in the county of Glamorgan (<i>Colonel Stuart</i>)	36
15. —	CHESTERFIELD (<i>Mr. Francis Arkwright</i>)	42
—	BOGNOR (<i>Colonel Barttelot</i>)	87
—	ARBROATH, in public meeting assembled; H. Patterson, chairman (<i>Mr. Baxter</i>)	1
—	Women of MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Callender</i>)	1,686
—	Inhabitants of EAST KILBRIDE (<i>Sir Thomas Colebrooke</i>)	147
—	MELROSE, in public meeting assembled; David D. Deals, chairman (<i>Sir George Douglas</i>)	1
15. —	HACKNEY (<i>Mr. John Holms</i>)	1,280
—	Women of HACKNEY (<i>Mr. John Holms</i>)	787
—	Inhabitants of STAFFORD (<i>Mr. Macdonald</i>)	48
—	STRATHAVEN, in public meeting assembled; Andrew Shearer, chairman (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	1
—	BIRNAM (<i>Sir William Maxwell</i>)	120
—	ROCHDALE (<i>Mr. Potter</i>)	904
—	WESTMINSTER (<i>Mr. William Smith</i>)	861
—	— (<i>Mr. William Smith</i>)	1,249
—	LEEDS (<i>Mr. Wheelhouse</i>)	101
—	— (<i>Mr. Wheelhouse</i>)	119
—	WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM and others (<i>Mr. Wheelhouse</i>)	314

April 15. Inhabitants of DENBIGH, in public meeting assembled; J. P. Jones, mayor, chairman (<i>Mr. Watkin Williams</i>)	1
16. — BATH (<i>Major Allen</i>)... ..	135
— Women of MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Birley</i>)	794
— Inhabitants of HULME (<i>Mr. Birley</i>)	1,242
— Women of MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Callender</i>)	1,041
— Inhabitants of KIRKSTALL, in public meeting assembled; W. H. Rinder, chairman (<i>Mr. Carter</i>)	1
— Women of SALFORD (<i>Mr. Cawley</i>)	705
— LOWER BROUGHTON, in the county of Lancaster (<i>Mr. Cawley</i>)	1,046
— SALFORD (<i>Mr. Cawley</i>)	603
— — (<i>Mr. Cawley</i>)	542
— Inhabitants of LOWER BROUGHTON (<i>Mr. Cawley</i>)	570
— — — (<i>Mr. Cawley</i>)	714
— MARYLEBONE (<i>Sir Thomas Chambers</i>)	1,627
— DROITWICH, in public meeting assembled; S. S. Roden, chairman (<i>Colonel Corbett</i>)	1
— CHELSEA (<i>Sir Charles Dilke</i>)	1,475
— — (<i>Sir Charles Dilke</i>)	1,805
— SWANSEA (<i>Mr. Dillwyn</i>)	114
— Women of RUSHOLME, in the county of Lancaster (<i>Mr. Hardcastle</i>)	178
— PLATT, in the county of Lancaster (<i>Mr. Hardcastle</i>)	48
— Inhabitants of DIDSBUY and WITHINGTON (<i>Mr. Hardcastle</i>)	46
— LONGSIGHT and its vicinity (<i>Mr. Hardcastle</i>)	235
— LEICESTER (<i>Mr. Heygate</i>)	48
— Women of BRISTOL (<i>Mr. Kirkman Hodgson</i>)	1,262
— Inhabitants of LONDONDERRY, in public meeting assembled; (<i>Name illegible</i>) chairman (<i>Mr. Charles Lewis</i>)	1
— EDINBURGH (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	747
— Lord Provost, Magistrates, and Council of EDINBURGH (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)... ..	Seal 1.
— Inhabitants of Rochdale (<i>Mr. Potter</i>)	926
— LEEDS (<i>Mr. Tennant</i>)	178
17. Women of Saint Michael's Ward, MANCHESTER (<i>Sir Thomas Bazley</i>)	1,226
— Inhabitants of New Cross Ward, MANCHESTER (<i>Sir Thomas Bazley</i>)	597
— Women of MANCHESTER (<i>Sir Thomas Bazley</i>)... ..	818
— Hulme, MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Birley</i>)	813
— Inhabitants of MILES PLATTING and NEWTON HEATH (<i>Mr. Callender</i>)	400
— Women of SALFORD (<i>Mr. Charley</i>)	659
— BROUGHTON (<i>Mr. Charley</i>)... ..	545
— Inhabitants of SALFORD (<i>Mr. Charley</i>)... ..	738
— SHREWSBURY (<i>Mr. Cotes</i>)	113
— EDINBURGH (<i>Mr. Cowan</i>)	1,004
— GRANTON (<i>The Earl of Dalkeith</i>)	100
— COVENTRY, in public meeting assembled; (<i>Name illegible</i>) chairman (<i>Mr. Eaton</i>)	1

April 17. Inhabitants of FALLOWFIELD and BIRCH, in the county of Lancaster (<i>Mr. Algernon Egerton</i>)	107
— DIDSBUY (<i>Mr. Algernon Egerton</i>)	46
— RUSHOLME (<i>Mr. Algernon Egerton</i>)	82
— WITHINGTON (<i>Mr. Algernon Egerton</i>)	47
— PLATT (<i>Mr. Algernon Egerton</i>)	48
— LOCKERBIE (<i>Mr. Johnstone</i>)	255
— Cluny Hill Hydropathic Establishment, FORRES (<i>Mr. Mackintosh</i>)	46
— MUSSELBURGH (<i>Mr. Macgregor</i>)	35
— GATEHOUSE, in public meeting assembled; John Hall, chairman (<i>Mr. Maitland</i>)	1
— BRISTOL, in public meeting assembled; John W. Caldicott, chairman (<i>Mr. Morley</i>)	1
— CASTLE DOUGLAS, in public meeting assembled; Joseph Howard, chairman (<i>Mr. Morley</i>)	1
— KIRKPATRICK, Durham; Alexander L. Lennan, chairman (<i>Mr. Morley</i>)	1
— GALASHIELS, in public meeting assembled; Wm. M'Kay, chairman (<i>Mr. Trevelyan</i>)	1
— ADDISCOMBE (<i>Mr. Watney</i>)... ..	48
20. — MONTROSE, in public meeting assembled; James Clark, chairman (<i>Mr. Baxter</i>)	1
— Women of St. Michael's Ward, MANCHESTER (<i>Sir Thomas Bazley</i>)	594
— Inhabitants of IPSWICH, in public meeting assembled; Edward Grimwade, chairman (<i>Mr. Bulwer</i>)	1
— Women of All Saints' Ward, MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Callender</i>)	547
— Inhabitants of STIRLING (<i>Mr. Campbell-Bannerman</i>)	138
— LEEDS (<i>Mr. Carter</i>)	186
— NEWPORT, Isle of Wight, in public meeting assembled; Herbert J. Orchard, chairman (<i>Mr. Clifford</i>)	1
— DUNBAR (<i>Sir Henry Ferguson Davie</i>)	43
— BANNOCKBURN (<i>Admiral Edmonstone</i>)	56
— BONNYBRIDGE (<i>Admiral Edmonstone</i>)	113
— BONNYBRIDGE, in public meeting assembled; George Ure, chairman (<i>Admiral Edmonstone</i>)	1
— MERTHYR TYDFIL (<i>Mr. Fothergill</i>)	35
— OSWESTRY (<i>Mr. Ralph Ormsby Gore</i>)	477
— CROYDON, in the county of Surrey (<i>Mr. Grantham</i>)	73
— Provost, Magistrates, and Council of DUMBARTON (<i>Mr. John Harrison</i>)	Seal. 1
— Inhabitants of CARPERLEY (<i>Viscount Helmsley</i>)	49
— FESTINGOG, in public meeting assembled; Evan Evans, chairman (<i>Mr. Holland</i>)	1
— BOWDON and ALTRINCHAM (<i>Colonel Leigh</i>)	917
— THOMAS BOLTON and others (<i>Mr. Richardson</i>)... ..	48

	April 20. Inhabitants of LERWICK, in public meeting assembled; John Robertson, chairman	1
¶	21. Women of MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Callender</i>) ...	781
¶	— SALFORD (<i>Mr. Cawley</i>)	679
¶	— — (<i>Mr. Cawley</i>)	570
¶	— — (<i>Mr. Cawley</i>)	565
¶	Inhabitants of INVERARY (<i>Sir W. Cuninghame</i>)	48
¶	— STOCKTON-ON-TEES (<i>Mr. Dodds</i>)	312
¶	— — (<i>Mr. Dodds</i>)	291
¶	— COVENTRY (<i>Mr. Eaton</i>)	431
¶	— BATTLEDOWN, Charlton Kings (<i>Mr. Agg-Gardner</i>)	15
¶	— CHELTENHAM (<i>Mr. Agg-Gardner</i>)... ..	68
¶	— — (<i>Mr. Agg-Gardner</i>)... ..	60
¶	— — (<i>Mr. Agg-Gardner</i>)... ..	86
¶	LUCY F. M. PHILLIPS (<i>Mr. Agg-Gardner</i>) ...	1
¶	Inhabitants of CHURCH STRETTON, in the county of Salop (<i>Sir Percy Herbert</i>)... ..	48
¶	— SOUTHWARK (<i>Mr. Locke</i>)	1,657
¶	— FINSBURY (<i>Mr. Lusk</i>)	2,014
¶	— — (<i>Mr. Lusk</i>)	1,449
¶	— LOUGHBOROUGH (<i>Lord John Manners</i>) ...	106
¶	HANNAH CLARKE and others (<i>Lord John Manners</i>)	96
¶	Provost, Magistrates, and Town Council of SELKIRK (<i>Mr. Trevelyan</i>)	Seal. 5
¶	Inhabitants of GLOUCESTER (<i>Mr. Wait</i>) ...	102
¶	— — (<i>Mr. Wait</i>)	101
¶	— BEDFORD (<i>Mr. Whitbread</i>)... ..	41
¶	16. — SOUTHPORT (<i>Mr. Secretary Cross</i>)	48
¶	22. — CAUSEWAYHEAD (<i>Mr. Adam</i>)	21
¶	Women of HULME (<i>Mr. Birley</i>)	568
¶	— New Cross Ward, MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Birley</i>)	619
¶	— KEYNSHAM (<i>Major Bousfield</i>)	272
¶	— HULME (<i>Mr. Callender</i>)	695
¶	— SALFORD (<i>Mr. Cawley</i>)	686
¶	Inhabitants of PENICUIK (<i>Earl of Dalkeith</i>) ...	150
¶	— SWANSEA (<i>Mr. Dillwyn</i>)	156
¶	— KIDDERMINSTER (<i>Mr. Dixon</i>)	17
¶	— DINGWALL, in public meeting assembled; S. Eneas Adam, chairman (<i>Mr. Pender</i>)	1
¶	— LEEDS (<i>Mr. Wheelhouse</i>)	99
¶	23. — PORTSOY, in the county of Banff (<i>Mr. Robert Duff</i>)	32
¶	— MARY ANN KIDGELL and others (<i>Mr. Samuelson</i>)	43
¶	24. Women of All Saints' Ward, MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Birley</i>)	651
¶	Inhabitants of BELFAST, in public meeting assembled; Marriott Robert Dalway, chairman (<i>Mr. James Corry</i>)... ..	1
¶	— EDINBURGH (<i>Mr. Cowan</i>)	1,004
¶	— NORTH BERWICK (<i>Sir Henry Davie</i>)	76
¶	— HADDINGTON (<i>Sir Henry Davie</i>)	174
¶	— BIRMINGHAM, in public meeting assembled; J. Chamberlain, mayor, chairman (<i>Mr. Dixon</i>)	1

¶	April 24. Inhabitants of LARBERT (<i>Admiral Edmonstone</i>)	64
¶	— — BLAERLOGIE (<i>Admiral Edmonstone</i>) ...	30
¶	— Members of the Sons of the Rock Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, STIRLING; Colin Cross, lodge deputy (<i>Admiral Edmonstone</i>)	1
¶	— Inhabitants of WESTBURY; A. Greenwell, chairman (<i>Sir George Jenkinson</i>) ...	1
¶	— — BEITH (<i>Mr. Montgomerie</i>)	234
¶	— — KILWINNING (<i>Mr. Montgomerie</i>)	183
¶	— — DALRY (<i>Mr. Montgomerie</i>)	177
¶	— Members of the Independent Order of Good Templars (Saint Ronan's Lodge), INNERLEITHEN (<i>Sir Graham Montgomery</i>)	15
¶	— Inhabitants of PORT MADOC, in public meeting assembled; Robert Rowland, chairman (<i>Mr. Pennant</i>)	1
¶	— — LEEDS (<i>Mr. Tennant</i>)	258
¶	— — (<i>Mr. Whitbread</i>)	242
¶	— — SILKSWORTH	45
¶	27. — GLENLUCE, in the county of Wigtown (<i>Mr. Agnew</i>)	328
¶	— — IRVINE (<i>Sir William Cuninghame</i>)	198
¶	— — DALKEITH (<i>Earl of Dalkeith</i>)	165
¶	— — KILMARNOCK (<i>Mr. John Harrison</i>)... ..	266
¶	— — TIVERTON, in the county of Somerset (<i>Mr. Hayter</i>)... ..	184
¶	— — MARSH, in the county of York (<i>Mr. Leatham</i>)	27
¶	— Members of the SNIDLEY CUM QUARMBY Working Men's Club (<i>Mr. Leatham</i>)..	27
¶	— Inhabitants of DUMFRIES (<i>Mr. Ernest Noel</i>) ...	675
¶	— Provost, Magistrates, and Town Council of DUMFRIES (<i>Mr. Ernest Noel</i>)... ..	Seal. 1
¶	28. Inhabitants of KENNAWAY, in the county of Fife (<i>Sir Robert Anstruther</i>)	36
¶	— — LEIGHTON BUZZARD, in the county of Bedford (<i>Mr. Bassett</i>)... ..	126
¶	— — HIGH WYCOMBE (<i>Colonel Carrington</i>) ...	443
¶	— — SALFORD (<i>Mr. Cawley</i>)	594
¶	— — CHELSEA (<i>Mr. William Gordon</i>)	956
¶	— Members of the NEWPORT Lodge of Good Templars; Edward Parker, chairman (<i>Mr. Edward Jenkins</i>)... ..	1
¶	— Inhabitants of EDINBURGH, in public meeting assembled; Priscilla M'Laren, president (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	1
¶	— — TOWER HAMLETS (<i>Mr. Samuda</i>)	1,364
¶	— — DUBLIN (<i>Colonel Taylor</i>)	1,003
¶	— — TIPPERARY (<i>Colonel Taylor</i>)	50
¶	— — BOYSTOWN, in the county of Meath (<i>Colonel Taylor</i>)	52
¶	29. — SOUTHWARK and BERMONDSEY (<i>Colonel Beresford</i>)	1,589
¶	— — Saint Michael's Ward, MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Callender</i>)	620

	April 29. Inhabitants of LEEDS, in the county of York (<i>Mr. Carer</i>)	343
†	— — — — — (<i>Mr. Carter</i>)	266
†	Female Inhabitants of MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Birley</i>)	518
†	Inhabitants of HAVERSTOCK HILL and KENTISH TOWN (<i>Sir Thomas Chambers</i>)	681
†	— MARYLEBONE (<i>Sir Thomas Chambers</i>)	909
96	— MARYLEBONE, in public meeting assembled, in Westbourne Hall, Bayswater; Geo. Sims, chairman (<i>Sir Thos. Chambers</i>)	1
96	— MARYLEBONE, in public meeting assembled; T. Hughes, chairman (<i>Sir Thomas Chambers</i>)	1
†	— OLDHAM (<i>Mr. Cobbett</i>)	367
—	— EAST PECKHAM (<i>Mr. Dyke</i>)	84
†	— LAMBETH (<i>Sir James Lawrence</i>)	1,957
†	— STRATFORD (<i>Colonel Makins</i>)	660
†	— CLIFTON (<i>Mr. Morley</i>)	378
—	— BEDMINSTER, Bristol (<i>Mr. Morley</i>)	373
—	— LLANDUDNO (<i>Mr. Morley</i>)	61
—	— INVERKIP, in the county of Renfrew (<i>Colonel Mure</i>)	153
96	— KIRKWALL, in public meeting assembled; M. A. W. Ninne, chairman (<i>Mr. Pender</i>)	1
96	— HAWICK, in public meeting assembled; John Wilson, chairman (<i>Mr. Trevelyan</i>)	1
—	ELLEN WATSON	1
—	20. Inhabitants of CAMBUSKENNETH (<i>Mr. Adam</i>)	29
—	— DOLLEAR (<i>Mr. Adam</i>)	208
—	— ALLOA (<i>Mr. Adam</i>)	202
†	— All Saints' Ward, MANCHESTER (<i>Sir Thomas Bazley</i>)	534
†	— Saint Michael's Ward, MANCHESTER (<i>Sir Thomas Bazley</i>)	832
†	— HULME, Manchester (<i>Sir Thomas Bazley</i>)	609
†	LUCY F. M. PHILLIPS, 4, Wellington Square, Cheltenham (<i>Sir Michael Hicks Beach</i>)	1
†	Inhabitants of SALFORD (<i>Mr. Cawley</i>)	347
†	— — — — — (<i>Mr. Cawley</i>)	1,077
†	— — — — — (<i>Mr. Cawley</i>)	718
†	Female Inhabitants of SALFORD (<i>Mr. Cawley</i>)	642
†	— — — — — (<i>Mr. Cawley</i>)	555
†	Inhabitants of BELFAST (<i>Mr. James Corry</i>)	100
†	— EDINBURGH (<i>Mr. James Cowan</i>)	1,024
†	— MARYLEBONE (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	994
†	— GREAT YARMOUTH (<i>Sir Edmund Lacon</i>)	10
†	— — — — — (<i>Sir Edmund Lacon</i>)	12
—	— WESTBURY, Wilts (<i>Mr. Laverton</i>)	120
—	— TROON (<i>Mr. Montgomerie</i>)	152
96	— STAFFORD, in public meeting assembled; John Kelsall, chairman (<i>Mr. Salt</i>)	1
96	— THURSO, in public meeting assembled: J. W. Galloway, chairman (<i>Sir John Sin- clair</i>)	1

†	April 30. Inhabitants of OLDHAM (<i>Mr. Serjeant Spinks</i>) ...	386
†	— — — — — LEEDS (<i>Mr. Tennant</i>)	143
—	— — — — — BENTHAM (<i>Sir Mathew Wilson</i>)	67
†	May 1. — LEVEN (<i>Sir Robert Anstruther</i>)	53
†	— All Saints' Ward, MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Callender</i>)	308
96	— ABERYSTWITTH, in public meeting assem- bled; P. Williams, chairman (<i>Mr. David Davies</i>)	1
—	— THORNHILL, Dumfriesshire (<i>Mr. Johnstone</i>)	289
†	— EDINBURGH (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	1,004
†	— LONGTON (<i>Dr. Lush</i>)	48
—	— SHREWSBURY (<i>Mr. Robertson</i>)	116
—	— CHAILEY and NEWICK (<i>Mr. Scott</i>)	119
—	— LEEDS (<i>Mr. Tennant</i>)	333
—	DEBORAH BENNETT and others (<i>Mr. Tennant</i>)	239
—	Inhabitants of LEEDS (<i>Mr. Wheelhouse</i>) ...	324
96	4. Provost, Magistrates, and Town Council of DUNFERMLINE (<i>Mr. Campbell Banner- man</i>)	Seal 1
—	Female Inhabitants of SALFORD (<i>Mr. Charley</i>)	454
†	Inhabitants of ACTON, in the county of Middle- sex (<i>Mr. Coope</i>)	88
—	— — — — — (<i>Mr. Coope</i>)	169
†	HARRIET PYNE and others (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	28
96	Vestry of SAINT PANCRAS (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	Seal 1
†	Inhabitants of CHELSEA (<i>Mr. Wm. Gordon</i>) ...	1,201
†	MARY BUTLIN BROWN and others (<i>Mr. Ward Hunt</i>)	65
96	Inhabitants of AYLESBURY, in public meeting assembled; Acton Tindall, chairman (<i>Mr. Lambert</i>)	1
†	— DAVENTRY (<i>Sir Rainald Knightley</i>)	74
96	— STALYBRIDGE, in public meeting assembled; S. A. Steinthal, chairman (<i>Mr. Side- bottom</i>)	1
†	— LEEDS (<i>Mr. Wheelhouse</i>)	179
†	5. Inhabitants of All Saints' Ward, MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Birley</i>)	422
†	— WOOLWICH (<i>Mr. Boord</i>)	585
—	— CHARLTON (<i>Mr. Boord</i>)	52
96	— WOOLWICH, in public meeting assembled; William Rowbotham, chairman (<i>Mr. Boord</i>)	1
†	— LEEDS (<i>Mr. Carter</i>)	338
†	— SALFORD (<i>Mr. Cawley</i>)	263
†	— — — — — (<i>Mr. Cawley</i>)	332
—	— LASSWADE (<i>Earl of Dalkeith</i>)	86
—	— HACKNEY (<i>Mr. Fawcett</i>)	1,362
†	— GORTON, in the county of Lancaster (<i>Mr. Hardcastle</i>)	867
—	— LEICESTER (<i>Mr. Alex. M'Arthur</i>)	75
†	— BRISTOL (<i>Mr. Morley</i>)	1,016
†	— — — — — (<i>Mr. Morley</i>)	101
†	6. — MANCHESTER (<i>Sir Thomas Bazley</i>)	898
—	MARY DICK, Burntisland (<i>Sir R. Anstruther</i>)	1

5	May 6.	Inhabitants of CIRENCESTER, in public meeting assembled; H. Ashbury, chairman (<i>Mr. Bathurst</i>)... ..	1
5	—	BLACKBURN, in public meeting assembled; J. Morgan, chairman (<i>Mr. Briggs</i>) ...	1
9	—	MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Callender</i>)	517
9	—	JAMES PRINCE and others (<i>Mr. Carter</i>)	77
9	—	LISETTE M. GREGORY and others (<i>Sir Thomas Chambers</i>)	14
9	—	Inhabitants of SALFORD (<i>Mr. Charley</i>)... ..	274
9	—	RETFORD, in the county of Notts (<i>Viscount Galway</i>)	128
—	—	WINDSOR (<i>Mr. Richardson Gardner</i>)	312
—	—	(<i>Mr. Richardson Gardner</i>)	334
9	—	Female Inhabitants of WOOLWICH (<i>Mr. William Ewart Gladstone</i>)	65
9	—	Inhabitants of PLUMSTEAD, in the county of Kent (<i>Mr. William Ewart Gladstone</i>)	1,240
9	—	Female Inhabitants of HAVERSTOCK HILL (<i>Lord George Hamilton</i>)	75
9	—	Inhabitants of CHEETHAM, Manchester (<i>Mr. Hardcastle</i>)	212
9	—	Female Inhabitants of PRESTON (<i>Mr. Hermon</i>)	1,031
9	—	Inhabitants of BRISTOL (<i>Mr. Kirkman Hodgson</i>)	284
9	—	SOUTHWARK (<i>Mr. Locke</i>)	1,413
9	—	LARGS, in public meeting assembled; B. Kerr, chairman (<i>Mr. Montgomerie</i>)	1
9	—	LEICESTER (<i>Mr. Peter Taylor</i>)	124
9	—	WOLVERHAMPTON, in public meeting assembled; T. G. Crippen, chairman (<i>Mr. Villiers</i>)	1
9	—	WIGAN, in public meeting assembled; W. Melling, chairman	1
7	—	KENNINGTON (<i>Colonel Beresford</i>)	1,203
—	—	SOUTHWARK (<i>Colonel Beresford</i>)	678
—	—	HACKNEY (<i>Mr. John Holms</i>)	1,035
—	—	BETHNAL GREEN (<i>Mr. John Holms</i>)	1,047
9	—	EXETER, in public meeting assembled; Thos. Ensor, chairman (<i>Mr. Johnson</i>)	1
—	—	EATON, in the county of Bucks (<i>Mr. Lambert</i>)	204
—	—	WALWORTH (<i>Sir James Lawrence</i>)... ..	863
—	—	Magistrates and Council of ABERDEEN (<i>Mr. Leith</i>)	Seal 1
—	—	Inhabitants of LAMBETH (<i>Mr. William M^r Arthur</i>)	685
—	—	Ross, in the county of Hereford (<i>Mr. Pateshall</i>)	48
—	—	(<i>Mr. Pateshall</i>)	17
—	—	(<i>Mr. Pateshall</i>)	50
—	—	(<i>Mr. Pateshall</i>)	49
—	—	(<i>Mr. Pateshall</i>)	29
—	—	ROCHDALE (<i>Mr. Potter</i>)	1,188
—	—	(<i>Mr. Potter</i>)	1,451
—	—	Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of DEWSBURY, in the county of York (<i>Mr. Serjeant Simon</i>)	Seal 2
—	—	Inhabitants of LEEDS (<i>Mr. Wheelhouse</i>)	73
—	—	(<i>Mr. Wheelhouse</i>)	207
—	—	Saint Michael's Ward, BRISTOL	316

5	May 8.	Inhabitants of DUNSTABLE, in public meeting assembled; T. Smallwood, chairman (<i>Mr. Bassett</i>)	1
9	—	MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Birley</i>)	551
—	—	WINDERMERE (<i>Mr. Clifton</i>)	27
—	—	BOLTON-LE-MOORS (<i>Mr. John Cross</i>)	1,118
—	—	ROSLIN, Midlothian (<i>Earl of Dalkeith</i>)	80
9	—	CHEETHAM, Manchester (<i>Mr. Alg. Egerton</i>)	516
9	—	CAMDEN TOWN (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	1,673
9	—	CRICKLADE, in public meeting assembled; H. Austin, Chairman (<i>Sir Dnl. Gooch</i>)	1
9	—	GORTON, in the county of Lancaster (<i>Mr. Hardcastle</i>)	604
—	—	Corporation of BRIDGWATER (<i>Capt. Hood</i>)	Seal 1
9	—	YORK, in public meeting assembled; John Marsh, chairman (<i>Mr. Leeman</i>)	1
9	—	FORRES (<i>Mr. Mackintosh</i>)	61
9	—	EDINBURGH (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)... ..	1,000
9	—	WEYMOUTH, in public meeting assembled; Alan Greenwell, chairman (<i>Mr. Portman</i>)	1
9	—	Bow, &c. (<i>Mr. Ritchie</i>)	1,378
9	—	TOWER HAMLETS (<i>Mr. Samuda</i>)	1,443
9	—	Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of MALDON; R. Smith, mayor (<i>Mr. Sandford</i>)	1
9	—	WESTMINSTER (<i>Mr. William Smith</i>)	1,018
9	—	LEICESTER (<i>Mr. Peter Taylor</i>)	Seal 1
9	—	Inhabitants of FINSBURY (<i>Mr. Torrens</i>)	946
11.	—	Female Inhabitants of MILES PLATTING, Manchester (<i>Sir Thomas Bazley</i>)	676
—	—	MILES PLATTING and NEWTON HEATH, Manchester (<i>Mr. Callender</i>)	512
9	—	SALFORD (<i>Mr. Charley</i>)	350
9	—	Inhabitants of EDINBURGH (<i>Mr. Cowan</i>)	655
—	—	CURRIE, Mid Lothain (<i>Earl of Dalkeith</i>)... ..	53
—	—	JUNIPER GREEN, Mid Lothain (<i>Earl of Dalkeith</i>)	62
9	—	WEYMOUTH, in public meeting assembled; Alan Greenwell, chairman (<i>Mr. Edwards</i>)	1
9	—	CHEETHAM, Manchester (<i>Mr. Algernon Egerton</i>)... ..	232
9	—	UPPER NORWOOD (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	75
9	—	DUBLIN (<i>Sir Arthur Guinness</i>)	506
9	—	Female Inhabitants of HACKNEY (<i>Mr. John Holms</i>)	518
9	—	Inhabitants of PORTOBELLO (<i>Mr. Macgregor</i>)	145
9	—	POLLOKSHAWs (<i>Colonel Mure</i>)	347
9	—	KILMALCOLM (<i>Colonel Mure</i>)	118
9	—	Female Inhabitants of GRAVESEND (<i>Sir Lawrence Palk</i>)	711
9	—	Inhabitants of Bow, in public meeting assembled; T. Scrutton, chairman (<i>Mr. Samuda</i>)... ..	1
9	—	Magistrates and Town Council of WIGTOWN; T. Murray, provost (<i>Mr. Stewart</i>)	1
9	—	Inhabitants of HAMMERSMITH	1,130
—	—	12. Female Inhabitants of SALFORD (<i>Mr. Cawley</i>)	256

¶	May 12. Female Inhabitants of St. Clement's Ward, MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Callender</i>) ...	1,064
	Inhabitants of CARLISLE (<i>Sir Thomas Colbrooke</i>) ...	116
—	— BELFAST (<i>Mr. Corry</i>) ...	158
—	— BETHNAL GREEN (<i>Mr. Fawcett</i>) ...	874
—	— MARYLEBONE (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>) ...	954
—	— BALA, in public meeting assembled; Owen Richards, chairman (<i>Mr. Holland</i>) ...	1
—	— LERWICK, in the county of Orkney and Shetland (<i>Mr. Laing</i>) ...	726
—	Members of the STROMNESS Town Council; John Stanger, magistrate (<i>Mr. Laing</i>) ...	2
—	Inhabitants of LONGHOPE, Orkney (<i>Mr. Laing</i>) ...	44
—	Members of the Committee of the STROMNESS Branch of the National Society for Women's Suffrage; James Spence, convener (<i>Mr. Laing</i>) ...	1
—	Inhabitants of STROMNESS (<i>Mr. Laing</i>) ...	204
—	Members of the Star of Pomona Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, STROMNESS (<i>Mr. Laing</i>) ...	42
—	Inhabitants of TINGWALL, Shetland (<i>Mr. Laing</i>) ...	155
—	— SOUTHWARK (<i>Mr. Locke</i>) ...	1,070
—	— LANARK (<i>Mr. Ramsay</i>) ...	179
—	— TOWER HAMLETS (<i>Mr. Ritchie</i>) ...	914
—	— SELKIRK, in public meeting assembled; J. Ballantyne, chairman (<i>Mr. Trevelyan</i>) ...	1
13.	— TIVERTON (<i>Major Allen</i>) ...	197
—	— WALTHAMSTOW (<i>Mr. Baring</i>) ...	646
—	Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of PLYMOUTH (<i>Mr. Bates</i>) ...	Seal. 1
—	CATHERINE REMINGTON and others (<i>Eurl of Bective</i>) ...	15
—	Female Inhabitants of New Cross Ward, MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Birley</i>) ...	437
—	Inhabitants of MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Birley</i>) ...	544
—	Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Birley</i>) ...	Seal.
—	Members of the United Friend Lodge of Good Templars, ARDWICK (<i>Mr. Birley</i>) ...	8
—	Inhabitants of NEWTON SAINT LOE (<i>Major Bousfield</i>) ...	125
—	Female Inhabitants of Ardwick Ward, MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Callender</i>) ...	530
—	Inhabitants of SALFORD (<i>Mr. Charley</i>) ...	427
—	— NEWCASTLETON (<i>Sir George Douglas</i>) ...	151
—	— READING (<i>Sir Francis Goldsmid</i>) ...	580
—	— TAMWORTH, in public meeting assembled; Brooke Lambert, chairman (<i>Mr. Hanbury</i>) ...	1
—	— BEDMINSTER (<i>Mr. Kirkman Hodgson</i>) ...	353
—	— PRESTON (<i>Mr. Holker</i>) ...	1,173
—	— PWLLHELI (<i>Mr. Hughes</i>) ...	48
—	— HUDDERSFIELD (<i>Mr. Leatham</i>) ...	321
—	— LIMERICK and other places (<i>Mr. O'Sullivan</i>) ...	103
—	— WESTMINSTER (<i>Sir Charles Russell</i>) ...	1,036
—	— LEEDS (<i>Mr. Tennant</i>) ...	308

¶	May 14. MARY BURTON and others (<i>Sir Thomas Bazley</i>) ...	543
—	Inhabitants of St. John's Ward, MANCHESTER (<i>Sir Thomas Bazley</i>) ...	512
—	— LEEDS (<i>Mr. Carter</i>) ...	340
—	— KENSINGTON and CHELSEA (<i>Sir C. Dilke</i>) ...	1,675
—	— KIDDERMINSTER (<i>Mr. Charles Harrison</i>) ...	47
—	— BELFAST (<i>Mr. Johnston</i>) ...	131
—	— NEW BRIGHTON, Cheshire (<i>Mr. Laird</i>) ...	33
—	Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of SCARBOROUGH (<i>Sir Charles Legard</i>) ...	Seal. 1
—	Inhabitants of LEEDS (<i>Mr. Tennant</i>) ...	256
—	— (<i>Mr. Wheelhouse</i>) ...	310
—	— LEEDS, in public meeting assembled; S. S. Dickenson, chairman (<i>Mr. J. Yorke</i>) ...	1
—	Female Inhabitants of GARVAGH, in the county of Derry ...	11
15.	Inhabitants of MAYBOLE (<i>Colonel Alexander</i>) ...	123
—	— BRIGHTON (<i>Mr. Ashbury</i>) ...	1,765
—	— MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Birley</i>) ...	646
—	— (<i>Mr. Callender</i>) ...	678
—	— LEEDS (<i>Mr. Carter</i>) ...	265
—	— BELFAST (<i>Mr. Corry</i>) ...	48
—	— RUGBY (<i>Mr. William Davenport</i>) ...	991
—	— (<i>Mr. William Davenport</i>) ...	695
—	— LANGHOLM, in public meeting assembled; James Bell, chairman (<i>Sir Harcourt Johnstone</i>) ...	1
—	— CAMBERWELL and other places (<i>Sir James Lawrence</i>) ...	2,073
—	— READING (<i>Mr. Lefevre</i>) ...	2,245
—	— TOBERMOREY (<i>Marquis of Lorne</i>) ...	104
—	— TOBERMOREY, in public meeting assembled; John MacLachlan, chairman (<i>Marquis of Lorne</i>) ...	1
—	— ELIZABETH WRIGHT, 55, India Place, Edinburgh (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>) ...	1
—	— AGNES CRAIG and another, Edinburgh (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>) ...	2
—	— MARGARET IRONSIDE, 1, Crichton Street, Edinburgh (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>) ...	1
—	— JESSIE WEST, 25, Cumberland Street, Edinburgh (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>) ...	1
—	— ISABELLA KIRK, 41, George Street, Edinburgh (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>) ...	1
—	— MARY C. RUSSELL, 2, Pitt Street, Edinburgh (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>) ...	1
—	— ISABELLA MACKERRACKER, Pitt Street, Edinburgh (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>) ...	1
—	— ISABELLA LAMB, 115, George Street, Edinburgh (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>) ...	1
—	— ELIZABETH ANNE MACQUEEN, 3, Landsdowne Crescent, Edinburgh (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>) ...	1
—	— MARY CLEGHORN, 5, South Street, Edinburgh (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>) ...	1
—	— MARGARET BELL, 55, George Street, Edinburgh (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>) ...	1

§	May 15.	Inhabitants of DALBEATTIE, in public meeting assembled; Thomas Maxwell, chairman (<i>Mr. Mailland</i>)	1
—	—	LOCHMABEN (<i>Mr. Ernest Noel</i>)	137
—	—	MILE END (<i>Mr. Ritchie</i>)	50
¶	—	Corporation of STALYBRIDGE (<i>Mr. Sidebottom</i>)	Seal. 1
¶	—	Inhabitants of COMRIE (<i>Sir William Maxwell</i>)	219
¶	Mar. 30.	DUNKELD (<i>Sir William Maxwell</i>)	162
¶	—	31. — PORTPATRICK (<i>Mr. Agnew</i>)	45
—	May 18.	Female Inhabitants of DARLINGTON (<i>Mr. Backhouse</i>)	986
—	—	Inhabitants of DARLINGTON (<i>Mr. Backhouse</i>)	1,615
¶	—	Provost, Magistrates, and Town Council of FORFAR (<i>Mr. Baxter</i>)	Seal. 1
¶	—	Inhabitants of EDINBURGH (<i>Mr. Cowan</i>)	559
¶	—	BRISTOL (<i>Mr. Kirkman Hodgson</i>)	378
¶	—	LONDON (<i>Mr. John Hubbard</i>)	538
¶	—	ELIZA A. KNOTT (<i>Mr. Johnstone</i>)	1
—	—	JOANNA F. CURRIE and others (<i>Mr. Johnstone</i>)	10
—	—	Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of BARROW IN FURNESS (<i>Mr. Stanley</i>)	Seal.
—	—	Inhabitants of NEW LUCE, in the county of Wigtown	244
—	—	19. — GIRVAN (<i>Colonel Alexander</i>)	153
—	—	Ardwick Ward MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Birley</i>)	585
¶	—	MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Birley</i>)	1,092
¶	—	SOUTHWARK (<i>Colonel Beresford</i>)	974
¶	—	New Cross Ward, MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Callender</i>)	730
¶	—	Female Inhabitants of St. Luke's Ward, MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Callender</i>)	1,065
¶	—	SALFORD (<i>Mr. Cawley</i>)	350
¶	—	Inhabitants of INGATESTONE and FRYERNING, in the County of Essex (<i>Lord Eustace Cecil</i>)	23
¶	—	DOWLAYS (<i>Mr. Fothergill</i>)	139
¶	—	PLUMSTEAD, in the county of Kent (<i>Mr. William Ewart Gladstone</i>)	800
¶	—	HELEN BLACKBURN and others (<i>Mr. Gordon</i>)	36
¶	—	Inhabitants of KILMARNOCK (<i>Mr. John Harrison</i>)	46
¶	—	SOUTHWARK and BERMONDSEY (<i>Mr. Locke</i>)	1,362
¶	—	LAMBETH (<i>Mr. William M^rArthur</i>)	806
§	—	GLOUCESTER, in public meeting assembled; David Wedderburn, chairman (<i>Mr. Monk</i>)	1
—	—	MAYNOOTH (<i>Mr. O'Clery</i>)	51
—	—	SLIGO (<i>The O'Conor Don</i>)	100
—	—	WINTERBOURNE and HANDBROOK (<i>Mr. Plunkett</i>)	88
¶	—	LEEDS (<i>Mr. Tennant</i>)	315
—	—	BOURTON ON THE HILL and MORETON IN MARSH, in the county of Gloucester (<i>Mr. John Yorke</i>)	53
§	—	14. — STROUD, in public meeting assembled; (<i>Name illegible</i>), chairman (<i>Mr. John Yorke</i>)	1

—	May 20.	Inhabitants of DUNFERMLINE (<i>Sir R. Anstruther</i>)	78
—	—	WHITTINGTON and CHESTERFIELD, in the county of Derby (<i>Mr. Francis Arkwright</i>)	23
¶	—	WOOLWICH (<i>Mr. Boord</i>)	831
¶	—	SALFORD (<i>Mr. Cawley</i>)	251
¶	—	Women of PENDLETON (<i>Mr. Charley</i>)	418
—	—	Inhabitants of HOLYWOOD, in the county of Down (<i>Mr. James Corry</i>)	56
¶	—	TRINITY (<i>Earl of Dalkeith</i>)	69
—	—	LOANHEAD, Mid Lothian (<i>Earl of Dalkeith</i>)	68
—	—	BONNYRIGG, Mid Lothian (<i>Earl of Dalkeith</i>)	149
¶	—	MARYLEBONE (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	406
¶	—	CHELSEA (<i>Mr. William Gordon</i>)	2,030
¶	—	DUBLIN (<i>Sir Arthur Guinness</i>)	152
¶	—	HAMPSTEAD (<i>Lord George Hamilton</i>)	745
—	—	GREAT STANMORE (<i>Lord George Hamilton</i>)	50
—	—	DINAS MAWDDWY, in the county of Merioneth (<i>Mr. Holland</i>)	49
¶	—	EDINBURGH (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	1,001
—	—	GRAVESEND (<i>Captain Pim</i>)	754
¶	—	Women Ratepayers of GRAVESEND (<i>Captain Pim</i>)	96
—	—	Inhabitants of HARROW in the county of Middlesex	95
—	—	21. FRENCHIE, in the county of Fife (<i>Sir Robert Anstruther</i>)	530
¶	—	Women of MILES PLATTING and NEWTON HEATH (<i>Mr. Birley</i>)	387
—	—	Inhabitants of WOOLWICH and PLUMSTEAD (<i>Mr. Boord</i>)	408
¶	—	DEPTFORD (<i>Mr. Boord</i>)	340
¶	—	DUBLIN (<i>Mr. Brooks</i>)	1,014
¶	—	LEEDS (<i>Mr. Carter</i>)	217
¶	—	— (<i>Mr. Carter</i>)	338
—	—	GREAT GRIMSBY (<i>Mr. Chapman</i>)	91
—	—	EDGWARE and LITTLE STANMORE, in the county of Middlesex (<i>Mr. Coope</i>)	55
¶	—	Members of the Pride of Rusholme Lodge of Good Templars, MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Algernon Egerton</i>)	23
¶	—	Inhabitants of CUPAR, in the county of Fife (<i>Mr. Ellice</i>)	144
¶	—	HACKNEY (<i>Mr. Fawcett</i>)	907
¶	—	— (<i>Mr. Fawcett</i>)	1,459
¶	—	MARYLEBONE (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	689
—	—	ANNE ISABELLA ROBERTSON, 2. St. James' Place, Blackrock, Dublin (<i>Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton</i>)	1
¶	—	Inhabitants of St. Paul's, BRISTOL (<i>Mr. Kirkman Hodgson</i>)	608
¶	—	HACKNEY (<i>Mr. John Holms</i>)	1,201
—	—	Provost, Magistrates, and Town Council of PAISLEY (<i>Mr. William Holms</i>)	Seal. 1
¶	—	Inhabitants of LAMBETH (<i>Sir James Lawrence</i>)	994
¶	—	FINSBURY (<i>Mr. Lusk</i>)	519

May 21.	Inhabitants of COUPAR ANGUS (<i>Sir W. Maxwell</i>)	80
—	— PITLOCHRY (<i>Sir William Maxwell</i>) ...	160
—	— AIRDRIE (<i>Mr. Ramsay</i>) ...	178
—	— MILE END, BOW, and STEPNEY (<i>Mr. Ritchie</i>)	1,205
—	— TOWER HAMLETS (<i>Mr. Samuda</i>) ...	1,162
—	— SELKIRK, in public meeting assembled; John Johnstone, chairman (<i>Mr. Trevelyan</i>) ...	1
—	— LEEDS (<i>Mr. Wheelhouse</i>) ...	336
—	— STOW ON THE WOLD, in the county of Gloucester (<i>Mr. John Yorke</i>) ...	20
—	— 22. Women of MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Birley</i>) ...	314
—	— Inhabitants of LIMERICK, in public meeting as- sembled; John Harte, Chairman (<i>Mr. Butt</i>) ...	1
—	— DUNFERMLINE (<i>Mr. Campbell-Bannerman</i>)	66
—	— SOUTH QUEENSFERRY (<i>Mr. Campbell- Bannerman</i>) ...	96
—	— LEEDS (<i>Mr. Carter</i>) ...	522
—	— PENDLETON, in the county of Lancaster (<i>Mr. Charley</i>) ...	182
—	— DUNDEE, in public meeting assembled; David Jobson, junior, chairman (<i>Mr. Edward Jenkins</i>) ...	1
—	— JANE BATESON and others (<i>Mr. Johnstone</i>) ...	367
—	— Members of the Vale of Athole Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, DUNKELD; R. M'Laren, worthy chief templar, and others (<i>Sir William Maxwell</i>) ...	11
—	— Inhabitants of LIVERPOOL (<i>Viscount Sandon</i>)	1,692
—	— — — (<i>Viscount Sandon</i>)	156
—	— LEEDS (<i>Mr. Tennant</i>) ...	408
—	— — (<i>Mr. Wheelhouse</i>) ...	112
—	— — (<i>Mr. Wheelhouse</i>) ...	314
—	— MARKET RASEN (<i>Mr. Winn</i>) ...	108
—	— GIRVAN (<i>Colonel Alexander</i>) ...	176
—	— FORFAR (<i>Mr. Baxter</i>) ...	80
—	— Members of the Pride of WEST BROMWICH Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars (<i>Mr. Brogden</i>) ...	35
—	— Inhabitants of LEEDS (<i>Mr. Carter</i>) ...	211
—	— COATBRIDGE (<i>Sir Thomas Colebrooke</i>) ...	206
—	— BELFAST (<i>Mr. James Corry</i>) ...	51
—	— RACHEL BROWN, Market Street, Haddington (<i>Sir Henry Ferguson Davie</i>) ...	1
—	— Inhabitants of CHELSEA (<i>Sir Charles Dilke</i>) ...	1,949
—	— WEYMOUTH (<i>Mr. Edwards</i>) ...	250
—	— — (<i>Mr. Edwards</i>) ...	250
—	— LEEDS (<i>Mr. Wheelhouse</i>) ...	264
—	— TEALBY (<i>Mr. Winn</i>) ...	22
—	— KESWICK, in the county of Cumberland (<i>Mr. Wyndham</i>) ...	48
—	— LEAMINGTON (<i>Earl of Yarmouth</i>) ...	34
—	— 2. — BIGGAR (<i>Sir Wyndham Anstruther</i>) ...	139

June 2.	Members of the Ever Faithful Lodge of the Order of Good Templars, HOWDON ON TYNE (<i>Mr. Beaumont</i>) ...	21
—	— JESSIE R. F. GREIG and others (<i>Mr. Charles Cameron</i>) ...	4,122
—	— Inhabitants of SPILSBY, in the county of Lin- coln (<i>Mr. Chaplin</i>) ...	41
—	— HORNCASTLE (<i>Mr. Chaplin</i>) ...	48
—	— WAINFLEET, in the county of Lincoln (<i>Mr. Chaplin</i>) ...	67
—	— MONMOUTH (<i>Mr. Cordes</i>) ...	147
—	— — (<i>Mr. Cordes</i>) ...	167
—	— BELFAST (<i>Mr. Crawford</i>) ...	163
—	— KEITH (<i>Mr. Robert Duff</i>) ...	30
—	— DOWAGER COUNTESS OF BUCHAN and others (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>) ...	12
—	— Inhabitants of LONDON (<i>Mr. Goschen</i>) ...	813
—	— WATFORD (<i>Mr. Halsey</i>) ...	14
—	— SAINT ALBAN'S (<i>Mr. Halsey</i>) ...	29
—	— Female Inhabitants of BATH (<i>Mr. Hayter</i>) ...	207
—	— Inhabitants of BATH (<i>Mr. Hayter</i>) ...	628
—	— Members of the Star of Broughty Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, BROUGHTY FERRY; William Nicoll, worthy chief templar (<i>Mr. E. Jenkins</i>)	1
—	— Inhabitants of HUDDERSFIELD, in public meet- ing assembled; Edward Huth, chair- man (<i>Mr. Leatham</i>) ...	1
—	— SARAH WHITE, of Tanfield Place, Leith (<i>Mr. Macgregor</i>) ...	1
—	— BARBARA ANDERSON, 31, Albert Terrace, Aber- deen, (<i>Mr. Macgregor</i>) ...	1
—	— ANN S. WALKER, 1, Thomson Place, Leith (<i>Mr. Macgregor</i>) ...	1
—	— CHRISTIANA DUNCAN, 258, Bonnington Road, Leith (<i>Mr. Macgregor</i>) ...	1
—	— HARRIET GRANT, 7, Janefield Place, Leith (<i>Mr. Macgregor</i>) ...	1
—	— ELIZA HENDERSON, 7, Janefield Place, Leith (<i>Mr. Macgregor</i>) ...	1
—	— Provost, Magistrates, and Town Council of PEEBLES (<i>Sir George Montgomery</i>) ...	Seal. 1
—	— Members of the BRISTOL and WEST of ENG- LAND Branch of the National Society for Women's Suffrage, in meeting as- sembled; Alan Greenwell, chairman (<i>Mr. Morley</i>) ...	1
—	— Inhabitants of DUBLIN (<i>Mr. O'Cleary</i>) ...	82
—	— CARLOW (<i>Mr. O'Cleary</i>) ...	110
—	— WEXFORD (<i>Mr. O'Cleary</i>) ...	202
—	— MUNSTER (<i>Mr. O'Sullivan</i>) ...	302
—	— Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of NORTH- AMPTON (<i>Mr. Phipps</i>) ...	Seal. 1
—	— Members of the Lincoln United Degree Temple (No. 105) LINCOLN (<i>Mr. Seely</i>) ...	37
—	— Inhabitants of DUBLIN (<i>Colonel Taylor</i>) ...	112

June 2.	Inhabitants of MAYO (<i>Colonel Taylor</i>)... ..	103
—	Female Inhabitants of DUBLIN (<i>Colonel Taylor</i>)	120
—	Inhabitants of MEATH (<i>Colonel Taylor</i>)	55
—	— LEEDS (<i>Mr. Tennant</i>)	264
4.	Magistrates and Members of the Town Council, ARBROATH (<i>Mr. Baxter</i>)	Seal.
—	Female Inhabitants of MANCHESTER (<i>Sir Thos. Bazley</i>)	364
—	— (<i>Sir Thomas Bazley</i>)	327
—	— (<i>Sir Thomas Bazley</i>)	668
—	— (<i>Sir Thomas Bazley</i>)	523
—	— (<i>Mr. Birley</i>)	673
—	Inhabitants of BIRMINGHAM (<i>Mr. John Bright</i>)	455
—	SOUTHSEA and PORTSMOUTH (<i>Mr. Bruce</i>)...	900
—	New Cross Ward, MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Callender</i>)	256
—	MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Callender</i>)	325
—	ALFORD, in the county of Lincoln (<i>Mr. Chaplin</i>)	104
—	HIGHGATE (<i>Mr. Coope</i>)	764
—	BELFAST (<i>Mr. Corry</i>)	191
—	OCKBROOK, and other places, in the county of Derby (<i>Mr. Evans</i>)	25
—	HILLTOWN, and other places, in the county of Louth (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	48
—	PENGE, and other places (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	107
—	CROYDON (<i>Mr. Grantham</i>)	204
—	BRISTOL (<i>Mr. Kirkman Hodgson</i>)	177
—	TAUNTON (<i>Sir Henry James</i>)	300
—	FROME (<i>Sir Massey Lopes</i>)	180
—	— (<i>Sir Massey Lopes</i>)... ..	151
9p	LOCHGILPHEAD, in public meeting assem- bled; J. Somerville, chairman (<i>Mar- quis of Lorne</i>)	1
9p	WIGTON, in the county of Cumberland, in public meeting assembled; B. Wilkin- son, chairman (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	1
—	CANTERBURY (<i>Mr. Majendie</i>)	447
—	AUCHTERARDER (<i>Sir William Maxwell</i>)	69
—	DUNBLANE (<i>Sir William Maxwell</i>)	110
—	ASTON MANOR, in the county of Warwick (<i>Mr. Newdegate</i>)	799
—	WESTMINSTER (<i>Mr. William Smith</i>)	757
—	— (<i>Mr. William Smith</i>)	648
—	Members of the Independent Order of Good Templars, GALASHIELS (<i>Mr. Trevelyan</i>)	15
—	Members of the Pride of the Border Lodge of Good Templars (<i>Mr. Trevelyan</i>)	8
—	Star of Peace Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, GALASHIELS (<i>Mr. Trevelyan</i>)	10
—	ALEXANDER COMBAT LODGE (<i>Mr. Trevelyan</i>)	14
—	Inhabitants of PORTADOWN (<i>Mr. Verner</i>)	48
—	Members of the Always Hope Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, MACCLESFIELD	6

June 4.	Members of the May Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, HARROGATE	22
—	5. Inhabitants of ILFRACOMBE (<i>Sir Thomas Dyke Acland</i>)	107
—	WANDSWORTH (<i>Mr. Attorney-General</i>)	159
—	New Cross Ward, MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Birley</i>)	748
—	BATH (<i>Major Bousfield</i>)	26
—	Female Inhabitants of BATH (<i>Major Bousfield</i>)	120
—	Inhabitants of MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Callenaer</i>)...	1,030
—	SALFORD (<i>Mr. Cawley</i>)	471
—	Female Inhabitants of PENDLETON (<i>Mr. Cawley</i>)	576
—	Inhabitants of BURGH LE MARSH, in the county of Lincoln (<i>Mr. Chaplin</i>)	65
—	JANET M'LAREN and another (<i>Mr. Cowan</i>)	2
—	MARGARET INGLIS (<i>Mr. Cowan</i>)	1
—	ANGES LILLIE (<i>Mr. Cowan</i>)	1
—	ANGES GUNION (<i>Mr. Cowan</i>)	1
—	CATHERINE MUIR (<i>Mr. Cowan</i>)	1
—	JESSIE BARTHOLOMEW (<i>Mr. Cowan</i>)	1
—	JANET H. B. YOUNG (<i>Mr. Cowan</i>)	1
—	CHRISTINA BARTHOLOMEW (<i>Mr. Cowan</i>)	1
—	LYDIA GREGORY (<i>Mr. Cowan</i>)	1
—	AGNES LAWRENCE (<i>Mr. Cowan</i>)	1
—	HELEN STURROCH (<i>Mr. Cowan</i>)... ..	1
9p	Inhabitants of HALTON LEA GATE, in the county of Northumberland, in public meeting assembled; John Palmer, chairman (<i>Mr. Cowan</i>)	1
9p	HALTWHISTLE, in the county of North- umberland, in public meeting as- sembled; John F. Graham, chairman, (<i>Mr. Cowan</i>)	1
—	BERKHAMPSTEAD (<i>Mr. Cowper</i>)	57
—	PETERHEAD (<i>Mr. Grant Duff</i>)	82
—	CUPAR (<i>Mr. Ellice</i>)	199
—	ISABELLA SCOTT (<i>Mr. Macgregor</i>)	1
—	ANN IRELAND (<i>Mr. Macgregor</i>)	1
—	Inhabitants of WIGTON, in the county of Cumberland (<i>Mr. Macgregor</i>)... ..	56
—	LEITH (<i>Mr. Macgregor</i>)	248
—	HALTWHISTLE (<i>Mr. Macgregor</i>)	148
9p	EDINBURGH, in public meeting assembled; J. Crighton, chairman (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	1
—	STRANRAER (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)... ..	802
—	EDINBURGH (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	950
9p	CLONMEL, in public meeting assembled; Edward Cantwell, mayor, chairman (<i>Mr. Moore</i>)	1
—	ANNAN (<i>Mr. Ernest Noel</i>)	135
—	LONGFORD (<i>Mr. O'Clery</i>)	112
—	GALWAY (<i>Mr. O'Sullivan</i>)	24
—	KILKENNY (<i>Mr. O'Sullivan</i>)	130
—	CORK (<i>Mr. Ronayne</i>)	50
—	— (<i>Mr. Ronayne</i>)	13
—	Members of the Burgh Lifeboat Lodge of Good Templars, BURGH LE MARSH, in the county of Lincoln (<i>Mr. Ed. Stanhope</i>)	11

¶ June 5.	Inhabitants of GALASHIELS (<i>Mr. Trevelyan</i>) ...	203
96 —	Members of the Fishermen's Rescue Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, BROUGHTY FERRY; John Scott, worthy chief templar (<i>Mr. Yeaman</i>) ...	1
¶ —	8. Inhabitants of LOUTH, in the county of Lincoln (<i>Sir John Astley</i>) ...	278
—	— CARNOUSTIE (<i>Mr. James Barclay</i>)... ..	109
—	— MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Callender</i>)	525
—	Female Inhabitants of PENDLETON (<i>Mr. Cawley</i>) ...	438
—	— SALFORD (<i>Mr. Charley</i>)	636
—	Inhabitants of PENDLETON (<i>Mr. Charley</i>) ...	387
—	Female Inhabitants of SALFORD (<i>Mr. Charley</i>) ...	401
—	— OPENSHAW (<i>Mr. Algernon Egerton</i>)	379
—	— NEWBURGH, in the county of Northumberland (<i>Lord Eslington</i>)	42
96 —	— NEWBROUGH, in the county of Northumberland, in public meeting assembled; J. Westgate Hetherington, chairman (<i>Lord Eslington</i>)	1
¶ —	— HORSHAM, in the county of Sussex (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	13
¶ —	— CIRENCESTER (<i>Sir Francis Goldsmid</i>)	486
—	— HARROW, in public meeting assembled; A. Treslove Cox, chairman (<i>Lord George Hamilton</i>)	1
¶ —	— HORFIELD (<i>Mr. Morley</i>)	184
—	— LANGSIDE (<i>Colonel Mure</i>)	65
¶ —	— CROSSHILL (<i>Colonel Mure</i>)	408
—	— CLARE (<i>Mr. O'Conor</i>)	100
—	— SLIGO (<i>The O'Conor Don</i>)	102
—	— QUEEN'S COUNTY, Ireland (<i>The O'Conor Don</i>)	102
¶ —	— PETERSHAM (<i>Sir Henry Peek</i>)	34
¶ —	— PUTNEY (<i>Sir Henry Peek</i>)	50
¶ —	— ROCHDALE (<i>Mr. Potter</i>)	3,048
¶ —	— STALYBRIDGE and DUKINFIELD (<i>Mr. Sidebottom</i>)	864
¶ —	— HUNSLET (<i>Mr. Tennant</i>)	191
¶ —	— HAWICK (<i>Mr. Trevelyan</i>)	257
¶ —	— GLOUCESTER (<i>Mr. Wait</i>)	500
¶ —	9. Inhabitants of Bradford and Openshaw, in the county of Lancaster (<i>Sir Thos. Bazley</i>) ...	251
¶ —	Female Inhabitants of Oxford Ward, MANCHESTER (<i>Sir Thomas Bazley</i>)	511
¶ —	— MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Birley</i>)	942
—	Inhabitants of Dublin (<i>Mr. Maurice Brooks</i>) ...	406
—	— SALFORD (<i>Mr. Cawley</i>)	299
¶ —	— LENZIE (<i>Sir Thomas Colebrooke</i>)	122
—	— CARSTAIRS (<i>Sir Thomas Colebrooke</i>)	142
—	— EDINBURGH (<i>Mr. Cowan</i>)	406
¶ —	— BELFAST (<i>Mr. Crawford</i>)	48
¶ —	— HACKNEY (<i>Mr. Fawcett</i>)	1,423
¶ —	CHARLES GREGORY and others (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>) ...	39
¶ —	ELIZABETH ANN PRICE and others (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>) ...	59

¶ June 9.	Inhabitants of DAVENTRY (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>) ...	12
¶ —	— EASTVALE (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	115
—	— CHIPPENHAM (<i>Mr. Goldney</i>)	158
—	— GLASTHULE, in the county of Dublin (<i>Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton</i>)	20
—	— WESTMEATH (<i>Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton</i>) ...	104
—	— BOOTERSTOWN (<i>Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton</i>) ...	30
—	— LOUTH (<i>Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton</i>)	113
—	— DUBLIN (<i>Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton</i>)	70
—	— — (<i>Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton</i>)	80
—	Members of the Liberal Association, BLUEPITS (<i>Mr. Hardecastle</i>)	46
¶ —	Inhabitants of THAME (<i>Mr. Henley</i>)	52
¶ —	— DALSTON and HACKNEY (<i>Mr. John Holms</i>) ...	986
—	— PAISLEY (<i>Mr. William Holms</i>)	177
¶ —	— PECKHAM (<i>Sir James Lawrence</i>)	50
—	ELIZABETH MARY WALSH, Sandycore, Dublin County (<i>Mr. O'Sullivan</i>)	1
—	MARIA SHAW, Dublin (<i>Mr. O'Sullivan</i>)	1
—	MARTHA SINNOTT, Williamstown, Dublin (<i>Mr. O'Sullivan</i>)	1
—	Members of the Spotland Liberal Association, ROCHDALE (<i>Mr. Potter</i>)	37
¶ —	— Castlemere Lodge of Good Templars, ROCHDALE (<i>Mr. Potter</i>)	52
¶ —	— Wesley Lodge of Good Templars, ROCHDALE (<i>Mr. Potter</i>)	52
¶ —	— Star of Freedom Lodge of Good Templars, ROCHDALE (<i>Mr. Potter</i>)	52
¶ —	— Liberal Association, Alley Lower Place, ROCHDALE (<i>Mr. Potter</i>)	30
¶ —	— Bright Star Lodge of Good Templars, ROCHDALE (<i>Mr. Potter</i>)	47
¶ —	— Hamer Liberal Association, ROCHDALE (<i>Mr. Potter</i>)	13
¶ —	Inhabitants of NORTH BOW and MILE END (<i>Mr. Ritchie</i>)	1,682
¶ —	— BRIGHTON (<i>General Shute</i>)... ..	1,351
¶ —	— WOLVERHAMPTON (<i>Mr. Weguelin</i>)	40
—	— BLACKBURN	26
—	10. BATHAMPTON (<i>Major Allen</i>)	39
—	— WESTON (<i>Major Allen</i>)	175
§ —	Members of the Tay Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, DUNDEE; John Johnston, worthy chief templar, and another (<i>Sir Robert Anstruther</i>)... ..	2
¶ —	Inhabitants of Oxford Ward, MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Birley</i>)	332
¶ —	— PORTSEA and LANDPORT (<i>Mr. Bruce</i>)	1,088
§ —	— DORCHESTER, in public meeting assembled; Henry Locke, chairman (<i>Mr. Brymer</i>)	1
¶ —	— DORCHESTER (<i>Mr. Brymer</i>)	412
¶ —	— LEEDS (<i>Mr. Carter</i>)... ..	301
—	— SHOREHAM (<i>Mr. Stephen Cave</i>)	94
¶ —	Female Inhabitants of IPSWICH (<i>Mr. Cobbold</i>) ...	248
¶ —	Inhabitants of GARTSHERRIE (<i>Sir T. Colebrooke</i>) ...	117

¶ June 10.	Inhabitants of BELFAST (<i>Mr. James Corry</i>) ...	123
—	WEST COANWOOD, in the county of North- umberland, in meeting assembled; John Newton, chairman (<i>Mr. Cowan</i>) ...	1
—	BRISTOL (<i>Mr. Grant Duff</i>) ...	125
—	Members of the United Compsall Lodge of Good Templars, MANCHESTER (<i>Mr.</i> <i>Algernon Egerton</i>) ...	12
—	Inhabitants of Blackley, MANCHESTER (<i>Mr.</i> <i>Algernon Egerton</i>) ...	44
—	E. R. CANNING and others (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>) ...	20
—	SUSAN JACKSON, Great Britain Street, Dublin (<i>Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton</i>) ...	1
—	ANNE KAVANAGH, Kingstown, Dublin (<i>Mr.</i> <i>Ion Trant Hamilton</i>) ...	1
—	ELIZA KELLY, Glashule, in the county of Dublin (<i>Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton</i>) ...	1
—	Inhabitants of BEWDLEY (<i>Mr. Charles Harrison</i>) ...	54
—	Members of the Saint John's Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars in DUNDEE; David McKenzie, worthy chief templar (<i>Mr. Edward Jenkins</i>) ...	1
—	Inhabitants of ONAGH, in the county of Tyrone (<i>Mr. Macartney</i>) ...	47
—	SAINT JOHN'S WOOD (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>) ...	43
—	DALBEATTIE (<i>Mr. Maitland</i>) ...	34
—	INVERGORDON, in public meeting assem- bled; James MacKillican, chairman (<i>Mr. Matheson</i>) ...	1
—	LOCHFOOT and other places (<i>Mr. Maitland</i>) ...	150
—	BLAIRGOWRIE (<i>Sir William Maxwell</i>) ...	75
—	TAVISTOCK (<i>Lord Arthur Russell</i>) ...	123
—	WAKEFIELD (<i>Mr. Sanderson</i>) ...	133
—	CAMBRIDGE (<i>Mr. Smollett</i>) ...	65
—	Female Inhabitants of DALKEY, in the county of Dublin (<i>Mr. Sullivan</i>) ...	12
—	Inhabitants of DUBLIN (<i>Mr. Sullivan</i>) ...	101
—	BLACKROCK, in the county of Dublin (<i>Mr.</i> <i>Sullivan</i>) ...	110
—	PENYDARRAN (<i>Mr. Talbot</i>) ...	75
—	MERTHYR (<i>Mr. Talbot</i>) ...	50
—	Members of the Congregation of Libanus Chapel, DOWLAIS (<i>Mr. Talbot</i>) ...	72
—	Members of the BROUGHTY FERRY Lodge of Good Templars, in meeting assembled; Peter Crystal, worthy chief templar (<i>Mr. Yeaman</i>) ...	1
—	11. Inhabitants of BATHEASTON (<i>Major Bousfield</i>) ...	149
—	BATHFORD (<i>Major Bousfield</i>) ...	55
—	HENDON (<i>Mr. Coope</i>) ...	61
—	Members of the Loyal Westminster Lodge of Good Templars, CHESTER (<i>Mr. Dodson</i>) ...	24
—	Inhabitants of Slateford, MID LOTHIAN (<i>Earl</i> <i>of Dalkeith</i>) ...	72
—	LEITRIM (<i>The O'Conor Don</i>) ...	103
—	WICKLOW (<i>The O'Conor Don</i>) ...	102

June 11.	Inhabitants of ROSCOMMON (<i>The O'Conor Don</i>) ...	112
—	KERRY (<i>The O'Conor Don</i>) ...	107
—	Members of the Liberal Association, ROCHDALE (<i>Mr. Potter</i>) ...	40
—	Inhabitants of SEATON CAREW (<i>Mr. Richardson</i>) ...	102
—	Members of the Alpha Lodge of Good Tem- plars, ALNWICK (<i>Mr. Ridley</i>) ...	48
—	Inhabitants of LIMERICK and KNOCK (<i>Mr. Synan</i>) ...	48
—	JOHN MILLER, J.P., and others (<i>Sir Richard</i> <i>Wallace</i>) ...	73
—	Inhabitants of DUNMORE, in the county of Ayr (<i>Colonel Alexander</i>) ...	127
—	WESTON-SUPER-MARE (<i>Major Allen</i>) ...	150
—	NEWPORT (<i>Mr. Cordes</i>) ...	324
—	12. EDINBURGH (<i>Mr. Cowan</i>) ...	394
—	AYR (<i>Sir William Cuninghame</i>) ...	361
—	Members of the MELROSE ABBEY Lodge of Good Templars, J. A. Dewar, worthy chief templar, and others (<i>Sir George</i> <i>Douglas</i>) ...	3
—	Inhabitants of MELROSE (<i>Sir George Douglas</i>) ...	116
—	CHIPPENHAM (<i>Mr. Estcourt</i>) ...	135
—	MALMESBURY (<i>Mr. Estcourt</i>) ...	132
—	CALNE, in the county of Wilts (<i>Lord</i> <i>Edmond Fitzmaurice</i>) ...	39
—	MARYLEBONE (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>) ...	64
—	— (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>) ...	128
—	GREENWICH (<i>Mr. Wm. Ewart Gladstone</i>) ...	351
—	WOOLWICH (<i>Mr. William Ewart Gladstone</i>) ...	294
—	DUBLIN (<i>Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton</i>) ...	106
—	— (<i>Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton</i>) ...	120
—	ELIZABETH WARD, Thomas Street, Dublin (<i>Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton</i>) ...	1
—	CATHERINE ANDREWS, Blackrock (<i>Mr. Ion</i> <i>Trant Hamilton</i>) ...	1
—	Inhabitants of BATH (<i>Mr. Hayter</i>) ...	44
—	Members of the Life Buoy Lodge of the Inde- pendent Order of Good Templars, LEITH; J. Allam, worthy chief tem- plar, and another (<i>Mr. Macgregor</i>) ...	2
—	NORAH M'DERMOTT, Tulla, in the county of Clare (<i>Mr. O'Sullivan</i>) ...	1
—	MARTHA KERR, Williamstown, Dublin (<i>Mr.</i> <i>O'Sullivan</i>) ...	1
—	ELIZABETH WALSH, Sandycove, in the county of Dublin (<i>Mr. O'Sullivan</i>) ...	1
—	JANE DOYLE, Roebuck, in the county of Dublin (<i>Mr. O'Sullivan</i>) ...	1
—	EMILY REDDY, Sandymount, in the county of Dublin (<i>Mr. O'Sullivan</i>) ...	1
—	Inhabitants of CLONTARF (<i>Mr. O'Sullivan</i>) ...	52
—	Attendants at a public meeting assembled at BRIMS HALL; Alexander Corner, chairman (<i>Mr. Pender</i>) ...	1
—	Inhabitants of ROCHDALE (<i>Mr. Potter</i>) ...	726
—	MALMESBURY (<i>Mr. Powell</i>) ...	104

¶ June 12. Inhabitants of BURNTISLAND (<i>Mr. Reed</i>) ...	46
— KILDARE (<i>Colonel Taylor</i>) ...	122
— DUBLIN (<i>Colonel Taylor</i>) ...	203
— GEASHILL and other places, King's County (<i>Colonel Taylor</i>) ...	107
— BLACKROCK (<i>Colonel Taylor</i>) ...	303
SARAH MAGUIRE, Westland Row, Dublin (<i>Colonel Taylor</i>) ...	1
— ANNE REDMOND, Kings Town, in the county of Dublin (<i>Colonel Taylor</i>) ...	1
— ELIZABETH WRIGHT, Summer Hill, Dublin (<i>Colonel Taylor</i>) ...	1
— Women of DUBLIN (<i>Colonel Taylor</i>) ...	65
— TIPPERARY (<i>Colonel Taylor</i>) ...	44
— BLACKROCK (<i>Colonel Taylor</i>) ...	114
— BRAY (<i>Colonel Taylor</i>) ...	26
— BLACKROCK (<i>Colonel Taylor</i>) ...	22
— DUBLIN (<i>Colonel Taylor</i>) ...	112
— Inhabitants of DEPTFORD ...	302
— GREENWICH ...	427
— STROMNESS, in public meeting assembled; James Spence, chairman ...	1
— 8. — SLIGO and other places (<i>Mr. O'Conor</i>) ...	102
— RATHDOWNNEY, in the Queen's County (<i>Mr. O'Conor</i>) ...	2
— 15. — CHELTENHAM (<i>Sir Michael Hicks Beach</i>) ...	16
— SOUTHWICK (<i>Sir Percy Burrell</i>) ...	1
— Robt. Penney, chairman (<i>Sir P. Burrell</i>) ...	227
— BRADFORD (<i>Mr. Callender</i>) ...	235
— Saint James's Ward, MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Callender</i>) ...	364
— Women of Saint James's Ward, MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Callender</i>) ...	380
— BRADFORD (<i>Mr. Callender</i>) ...	329
— Inhabitants of LEEDS (<i>Mr. Carter</i>) ...	262
— SALFORD (<i>Mr. Cawley</i>) ...	182
— PENDLETON (<i>Mr. Cawley</i>) ...	215
— KELSO (<i>Sir George Douglas</i>) ...	16
— SAINT PANCRAS Board of Guardians (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>) ...	1
— E. MARTIN, Baggot-street, Dublin (<i>Sir Arthur Guinness</i>) ...	44
— Women of CARLOW (<i>Sir Arthur Guinness</i>) ...	53
— BOOTERSTOWN (<i>Sir Arthur Guinness</i>) ...	1
— MARY CONNOLLY, Drumcondra, in the county of Dublin (<i>Sir Arthur Guinness</i>) ...	1
— ANNA MOORE, Moore-street, Dublin (<i>Sir Arthur Guinness</i>) ...	1
— Inhabitants of DALKEY, Dublin (<i>Sir Arthur Guinness</i>) ...	64
— KINGSTOWN, in the county of Dublin (<i>Sir Arthur Guinness</i>) ...	140
— DUBLIN (<i>Sir Arthur Guinness</i>) ...	130
— — (<i>Sir Arthur Guinness</i>) ...	103
— VALENTIA (<i>Mr. Herbert</i>) ...	8

¶ June 15. Inhabitants of BRISTOL (<i>Mr. Kirkman Hoagson</i>) ...	340
— Members of the District Lodge of the Inde- pendent Order of Good Templars, DUNDEE; Peter Matthews, president, and others (<i>Mr. Edward Jenkins</i>) ...	3
— Women of BELFAST (<i>Mr. Johnston</i>) ...	48
— Inhabitants of BATH (<i>Mr. Kinnaird</i>) ...	191
— CLIFTON (<i>Mr. Morley</i>) ...	362
— Assistant Masters of Clifton College, BRISTOL, (<i>Mr. Morley</i>) ...	14
— Inhabitants of BARRHEAD (<i>Colonel Mure</i>) ...	377
— Members of the Flower of Nithsdale and Life Guard Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, DUMFRIES (<i>Mr. Ernest Noel</i>) ...	8
— Saint Michael's Lodge of Free Templars, DUMFRIES; James H. Brown, worthy master, and others (<i>Mr. Ernest Noel</i>) ...	14
— QUEEN OF THE SOUTH Lodge of Free Tem- plars of St. John; James Craig, worthy master, and another (<i>Mr. Ernest Noel</i>) ...	2
— Women of SLIGO, and others (<i>Mr. O'Conor</i>) ...	50
— ELLEN DONNELLY, Hacketstown, in the county of Carlow (<i>Mr. O'Conor</i>) ...	1
— Inhabitants of CARRICK ON SHANNON (<i>Mr. O'Conor</i>) ...	16
— DUBLIN (<i>Mr. O'Conor</i>) ...	86
— — (<i>Mr. O'Sullivan</i>) ...	80
— CARSHALTON, in the county of Surrey (<i>Sir Henry Peek</i>) ...	101
— SOUTHAMPTON (<i>Sir Frederick Perkins</i>) ...	500
— IPSWICH ...	381
— 16. — GLENLUCE (<i>Mr. Agnew</i>) ...	496
— ANSTRUTHER (<i>Sir Robert Anstruther</i>) ...	67
— DYSART (<i>Sir Robert Anstruther</i>) ...	44
— BRIGHTON (<i>Mr. Ashbury</i>) ...	1,810
— WESTON-SUPER-MARE (<i>Mr. Richd. Bright</i>) ...	167
— Members of the Aim at Right Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, HYDE, in the county of Chester (<i>Mr. Cunliffe Brooks</i>) ...	23
— Inhabitants of MARYLEBONE and other places (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>) ...	746
— SOUTHAMPTON (<i>Mr. Gurney</i>) ...	308
— A. TARRY and others (<i>Mr. Heygate</i>) ...	75
— AGNES WATT, and others (<i>Mr. William Holms</i>) ...	15
— Members of the Christopher North Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Tem- plars, PAISLEY (<i>Mr. William Holms</i>) ...	19
— John Dunlop Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars PAISLEY (<i>Mr. William Holms</i>) ...	46
— Hope of Newhaven Lodge of the Indepen- dent Order of Good Templars, NEWHA- VEN; Jas. Thompson, worthy chief Templar, and another (<i>Mr. Macgregor</i>) ...	2

90	June 16. Members of Rescue Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, LEITH; G. Ballantyne, worthy chief templar, and another (<i>Mr. Macgregor</i>)	2
90	— LIFE BOAT LODGE of the Independent Order of Good Templars; Gilbert Auber, worthy chief templar, and another (<i>Mr. Macgregor</i>)	2
	Inhabitants of LEICESTER (<i>Mr. Alex. M. Arthur</i>)	125
	— DUMFRIES (<i>Mr. Ernest Noel</i>)	35
	— STOKENCHURCH (<i>Colonel North</i>)	103
	— BANTRY (<i>Mr. O'Clery</i>)	108
	— DUBLIN (<i>Mr. O'Clery</i>)	102
	— WEXFORD (<i>Mr. O'Clery</i>)	100
	— WESTMEATH, and other places (<i>Mr. O'Clery</i>)	115
	— DUBLIN (<i>Mr. O'Clery</i>)	130
	C. D. ROBERTSON, St. James's Place, Blackrock (<i>Mr. O'Clery</i>)	1
	MARY J. FARRELL, Glashule, in the county of Dublin (<i>Mr. O'Clery</i>)	1
	MARGARET REYNOLDS, Kingstown, in the county of Dublin (<i>Mr. O'Clery</i>)	1
	ANNE WHITEHEAD, Dublin (<i>Mr. O'Clery</i>)	1
	ELIZABETH SHERIN, George Street, Dublin (<i>Mr. O'Clery</i>)	1
	Women of BLACKROCK (<i>Mr. O'Clery</i>)	56
	— WILLIAMSTOWN (<i>Mr. O'Clery</i>)	13
	— WEXFORD (<i>Mr. O'Clery</i>)	30
	— ROSCOMMON and other places (<i>Mr. O'Clery</i>)	50
	— CLARE (<i>Mr. O'Clery</i>)	56
	— WICKLOW (<i>Mr. O'Clery</i>)	102
	Members of the Old Shildon Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, in the county of DURHAM (<i>Mr. Pease</i>)	54
	MARY A. BARKBY and others (<i>Mr. Pell</i>)	130
	Inhabitants of TAIN (<i>Mr. Pender</i>)	99
	— ROCHDALE (<i>Mr. Potter</i>)	1,042
	— MALMESBURY (<i>Mr. Powell</i>)	90
	— DONCASTER (<i>Mr. Spencer Stanhope</i>)	45
	— RATHMINES, in the county of Dublin (<i>Col. Taylor</i>)	48
	— DUBLIN (<i>Colonel Taylor</i>)	114
	— — (<i>Colonel Taylor</i>)	136
	— — (<i>Colonel Taylor</i>)	103
	— BLACKROCK (<i>Colonel Taylor</i>)	50
	MARY A. FITZSIMON, Richmond, Dublin (<i>Col. Taylor</i>)	1
	MARY BRENNAN, Kingstown, in the county of Dublin (<i>Colonel Taylor</i>)	1
	MARIA FALLON, Sandymount, in the county of Dublin (<i>Colonel Taylor</i>)	1
	Inhabitants of STOUDBRIDGE (<i>Mr. Walker</i>)	81
	— BROADWAY and other places, in the county of Worcester (<i>Mr. Walker</i>)	24
	— CROYDON (<i>Mr. Watney</i>)	67
	— HEAPHAM, in the county of Lincoln (<i>Mr. Winn</i>)	8

¶	June 15. Inhabitants of PERTH (<i>Mr. Kinnaird</i>)	191
¶	— 17. — WEDNESBURY, in public meeting assembled; R. B. Feast, chairman (<i>Mr. Brogden</i>)	1
¶	— — PENDLETON (<i>Mr. Charley</i>)	170
¶	— Women of PENDLETON (<i>Mr. Charley</i>)	433
¶	— — SALFORD (<i>Mr. Charley</i>)	346
—	Members of the Menai Lodge of Good Templars, LLANDYSILIO (<i>Mr. Richard Davies</i>)	54
—	Inhabitants of CRICKLADE, in the county of Wilts (<i>Mr. Estcourt</i>)	98
¶	— — BLACKBURN (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	326
¶	— — (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	261
¶	— — BRISTOL (<i>Mr. Kirkman Hodgson</i>)	564
¶	— Redcliffe, BRISTOL (<i>Mr. Kirkman Hodgson</i>)	446
¶	— — HACKNEY, (<i>Mr. John Holms</i>)	2,223
¶	— — PAISLEY (<i>Mr. William Holms</i>)	331
¶	— — (<i>Mr. William Holms</i>)	205
¶	— — (<i>Mr. William Holms</i>)	288
—	MARY POLLOCK, Paisley (<i>Mr. William Holms</i>)	1
—	E. WYLIE, Paisley (<i>Mr. William Holms</i>)	1
—	ANNABELLA CUNNINGHAME, Paisley (<i>Mr. William Holms</i>)	1
—	JANET CALDWELL, Paisley (<i>Mr. William Holms</i>)	1
¶	Inhabitants of LYMINGTON, in the county of Hants, in public meeting assembled; Henry Dorman, chairman (<i>Colonel Kennard</i>)	1
—	— LYMINGTON, in the county of Hants (<i>Colonel Kennard</i>)	40
—	— MIDDLETON, Manchester (<i>Mr. Melly</i>)	48
—	— WEST LINTON and MOUNTAIN CROSS (<i>Sir George Montgomery</i>)	73
¶	CATHERINE O'BRIEN, Dundrum (<i>Mr. Moore</i>)	1
¶	Inhabitants of FALKIRK (<i>Mr. Ramsay</i>)	295
¶	Women of WESTMINSTER (<i>Mr. William Smith</i>)	200
¶	Inhabitants of WESTMINSTER (<i>Mr. W. Smith</i>)	1,372
¶	— — LEICESTER (<i>Mr. Peter Taylor</i>)	128
¶	— — HOLBECK (<i>Mr. Wheelhouse</i>)	317
¶	— — LOUTH (<i>Mr. Winn</i>)	344
—	18. ELIZABETH NIXON, Lochnagar Place, Stranraer (<i>Mr. Agnew</i>)	1
—	SUSAN ELDER, London Road, Stranraer (<i>Mr. Agnew</i>)	1
—	ELIZABETH FENWICK, Glenluce (<i>Mr. Agnew</i>)	1
—	ANNIE WALES, Mill Bank Cottage, Glenluce (<i>Mr. Agnew</i>)	1
—	MARY M'MASTER, 3, Albany Place, London Road, Stranraer (<i>Mr. Agnew</i>)	1
—	ELIZABETH WILLIAMS, London Road, Stranraer (<i>Mr. Agnew</i>)	1
—	MARGARET WATT, London Road, Stranraer (<i>Mr. Agnew</i>)	1
—	MARGARET M'EWEN, High-street, Leswalt (<i>Mr. Agnew</i>)	1
—	ANN M'DOWALL, London Road, Stranraer (<i>Mr. Agnew</i>)	1

§	June 18. Inhabitants of BROUGHTY FERRY, in public meeting assembled; George J. A. Kidd, chairman (<i>Mr. James Barclay</i>)	1
¶	— HORNCASTLE (<i>Mr. Chaplin</i>) ...	42
¶	— HARROW and ENFIELD (<i>Mr. Coope</i>) ...	46
¶	— BICKLEY and other places (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)...	446
¶	— GREAT YARMOUTH (<i>Mr. Hopwood</i>) ...	52
¶	— THORNHILL, in the county of Dumfries, in public meeting assembled; T. B. Grierson, chairman (<i>Mr. Johnstone</i>)...	1
¶	— MAIDSTONE and YALDING (<i>Sir John Lubbock</i>)	461
¶	Women Ratepayers of Maidstone (<i>Sir John Lubbock</i>) ...	140
¶	Inhabitants of PORTOBELLO (<i>Mr. Macgregor</i>) ...	28
¶	Members of the Excelsior Club of the Independent Order of Good Templars, LEITH; Gilbert Archer, chief preses (<i>Mr. Macgregor</i>) ...	1
¶	— Pilot Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, LEITH; John Stewart, worthy chief templar, and another (<i>Mr. Macgregor</i>) ...	2
¶	Inhabitants of LEICESTER (<i>Mr. Alexander M'Arthur</i>) ...	184
¶	— LAMBETH and BATTERSEA (<i>Mr. William M'Arthur</i>) ...	1,649
¶	— LAMBETH (<i>Mr. William M'Arthur</i>) ...	936
¶	— STRATFORD (<i>Colonel Makins</i>) ...	986
¶	— — (<i>Colonel Makins</i>) ...	602
¶	— PLUMSTEAD and neighbourhood (<i>Mr. Pemberton</i>) ...	169
¶	— MILE END and STRATFORD (<i>Mr. Ritchie</i>)	130
¶	— BRIGHTON (<i>General Shute</i>) ...	1,598
¶	— MAIDSTONE (<i>Sir Sydney Waterlow</i>) ...	433
¶	19. — POOLE, in public meeting assembled; M. Kemp-Wold, J.P., chairman (<i>Mr. Ashley</i>)	1
¶	— BOLLINGTON and other places in the county of Chester (<i>Mr. Cunliffe Brooks</i>) ...	62
¶	— MARYLEBONE (<i>Sir Thomas Chambers</i>) ...	1,525
¶	— W. SIMS and others (<i>Mr. Coope</i>) ...	630
¶	— W. THORBURN and others (<i>Mr. Cowan</i>) ...	108
¶	— G. M. THOMAS, Rose Cottage, Gilmerton (<i>Earl of Dalkeith</i>) ...	1
¶	— ELIZABETH REDPATH, Gilmerton Bank House, Liberton (<i>Earl of Dalkeith</i>) ...	1
¶	Inhabitants of ROSLIN, in the county of Mid Lothian (<i>Earl of Dalkeith</i>) ...	20
¶	— GILMERTON (<i>Earl of Dalkeith</i>) ...	147
¶	— CROYDON (<i>Mr. Errington</i>) ...	50
¶	— — (<i>Mr. Errington</i>) ...	50
¶	— A. E. ALLISON and others (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>) ...	181
¶	— Members of the Saint Mary Lodge of Good Templars, CHELTENHAM (<i>Mr. Agg-Gardner</i>) ...	54
¶	20. — Inhabitants of CHIPPENHAM, in public meeting assembled; W. E. Darby, chairman (<i>Mr. Goldney</i>) ...	1

¶	June 19. Inhabitants of CHIPPENHAM (<i>Mr. Goldney</i>) ...	119
¶	— CHELSEA (<i>Mr. William Gordon</i>) ...	127
¶	— WANDSWORTH (<i>Mr. Grantham</i>) ...	1,436
¶	— DUBLIN (<i>Sir Arthur Guinness</i>) ...	515
¶	— — (<i>Sir Arthur Guinness</i>) ...	120
¶	— — (<i>Sir Arthur Guinness</i>) ...	221
¶	— ELIZA REED and others (<i>Lord George Hamilton</i>)	346
¶	— KATE LADELL and others (<i>Lord Geo. Hamilton</i>)	23
¶	— ELIZABETH MASON, Clontarf, Dublin (<i>Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton</i>) ...	1
¶	— MARY KEELY, Blackrock, Dublin (<i>Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton</i>) ...	1
¶	— Inhabitants of DUBLIN (<i>Mr. I. Trant Hamilton</i>)	205
¶	— — (<i>Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton</i>)	120
¶	— — (<i>Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton</i>)	141
¶	— NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE (<i>Mr. Hamond</i>) ...	2,352
¶	— — (<i>Mr. Hamond</i>) ...	2,928
¶	— CLAPTON and HACKNEY (<i>Mr. John Holms</i>)	31
¶	— COMBE DOWN and other places (<i>Mr. Hayter</i>)	375
¶	— BATH (<i>Mr. Hayter</i>) ...	322
¶	— FINSBURY (<i>Mr. Lusk</i>) ...	330
¶	— BO'NESS, in the county of Linlithgow (<i>Mr. M'Lagan</i>) ...	146
¶	— GUILDFORD (<i>Mr. Onslow</i>) ...	800
¶	— TORQUAY (<i>Sir Lawrence Palk</i>) ...	100
¶	— LINLITHGOW (<i>Mr. Ramsay</i>)...	233
¶	— Members of the Brother's Keeper Lodge of Good Templars, ALNWICK (<i>Mr. Ridley</i>)	29
¶	— Inhabitants of KETTERING (<i>Mr. Sackville</i>) ...	16
¶	— THRAPSTON and vicinity (<i>Mr. Sackville</i>) ...	120
¶	— LEEDS (<i>Mr. Tennant</i>) ...	117
¶	— HOLLOWAY (<i>Mr. Torrens</i>) ...	119
¶	— ISLINGTON (<i>Mr. Torrens</i>) ...	33
¶	— Women of FINSBURY (<i>Mr. Torrens</i>) ...	164
¶	22. Inhabitants of INCH, in the county of Wigtown (<i>Mr. Agnew</i>) ...	216
¶	— BILLINGSHURST (<i>Colonel Barttelot</i>) ...	18
¶	— PLYMOUTH (<i>Mr. Bates</i>) ...	546
¶	— MONTROSE (<i>Mr. Baxter</i>) ...	204
¶	— BLACKHEATH (<i>Mr. Boord</i>) ...	73
¶	— GREENWICH (<i>Mr. Boord</i>) ...	318
¶	— STIRLING (<i>Mr. Campbell-Bannerman</i>) ...	78
¶	— LEEDS (<i>Mr. Carter</i>) ...	1,007
¶	— BARNSTAPLE (<i>Mr. Thomas Cave</i>) ...	319
¶	— LINCOLN (<i>Colonel Chaplin</i>)...	106
¶	— Members of the William of Waynfleet Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, WAYNFLEET, in the county of Lincoln (<i>Mr. Chaplin</i>) ...	25
¶	— Inhabitants of LONDON (<i>Mr. Cotton</i>) ...	614
¶	— Women of SCOTLAND (<i>Mr. James Cowan</i>) ...	5,483
¶	— Inhabitants of NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE (<i>Mr. Joseph Cowen</i>) ...	2,345
¶	— — (<i>Mr. Joseph Cowen</i>)	2,337
¶	— — (<i>Mr. Joseph Cowen</i>)	819
¶	— Members of the NORTH LONDON Secular Club; George Lyon, chairman (<i>Mr. Fawcett</i>)	1

¶ June 22.	Inhabitants of STOKE NEWINGTON (<i>Mr. Fawcett</i>)	50
—	Members of the Minerva Club, HACKNEY; Thos. Emms, chairman (<i>Mr. Fawcett</i>)	1
—	Women of DALSTON and HACKNEY (<i>Mr. Fawcett</i>)	52
—	Inhabitants of the TOWER HAMLETS (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	1,346
—	Women of MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	398
—	SALFORD (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	340
—	ROSTREVOR, in the county of Down, Ireland (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	11
—	PENDLETON (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	388
—	Men of PENDLETON (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	212
—	ELIZABETH TRAVERS and others (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	252
—	Working Women of MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	301
—	Inhabitants of ABBEY WOOD, in the county of Kent (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	18
—	BANGOR (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	52
—	SALFORD (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	262
—	MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	280
—	BRADFORD (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	602
—	DUBLIN (<i>Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton</i>)	713
—	— (<i>Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton</i>)	314
—	BRIDGEWATER, in public meeting assem- bled; J. R. Smith, mayor, chairman (<i>Captain Hood</i>)	1
—	GATESHEAD-ON-TYNE (<i>Mr. James</i>)	2,401
—	— (<i>Mr. James</i>)	2,062
—	Members of the Conservative Ladies' Associa- tion, BRISTOL (<i>Sir George Jenkinson</i>)	232
—	Inhabitants of LAMBETH (<i>Sir James Lawrence</i>)	118
—	Women Ratepayers of LAMBETH (<i>Sir James Lawrence</i>)	212
—	Inhabitants of WILMSLOW (<i>Mr. Legh</i>)	15
—	ISABELLA — 9, Little Place, Edinburgh (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	1
—	ROBINA SCOTT, 6, Montague Street, Edinburgh (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	1
—	MARGARET ELLIOT, 72, Clive Street, Edinburgh (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	1
—	MARY THOMSON, 44, South Club Street, Edin- burgh (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	1
—	ALICE NICHOLSON, 38, Manilla Street, Edin- burgh (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	1
—	Inhabitants of EDDERTON, in the county of Ross (<i>Mr. Matheson</i>)	28
—	PLUMSTEAD, in the county of Kent (<i>Sir Charles Mills</i>)	207
—	DARTFORD, in the county of Kent, (<i>Sir Charles Mills</i>)	132
—	GLOUCESTER (<i>Mr. Monk</i>)	559
—	TOWER HAMLETS (<i>Mr. Ritchie</i>)	939
—	— (<i>Mr. Ritchie</i>)	839
—	LEEDS (<i>Mr. Tennant</i>)	718
—	KIRKSTALL (<i>Mr. Tennant</i>)	325
—	HUNSLET (<i>Mr. Wheelhouse</i>)	249
—	LEEDS (<i>Mr. Wheelhouse</i>)	724

June 22.	Members of the Women's Suffrage Club, DUN- DEE; Margaret Gilfillan, president (<i>Mr. Yeaman</i>)	1
—	Inhabitants of DUNDEE (<i>Mr. Yeaman</i>)	473
— 23.	BROUGHTY FERRY, in the county of Forfar (<i>Mr. James Barclay</i>)	55
—	DUBLIN (<i>Mr. Maurice Brooks</i>)	60
—	LOWER BROUGHTY (<i>Mr. Cawley</i>)	75
—	CHARLOTTE E. BABB and others (<i>Sir T. Chambers</i>)	6
—	Inhabitants of NORWICH (<i>Mr. Colman</i>)	303
—	— (<i>Mr. Colman</i>)	998
—	BIRMINGHAM (<i>Mr. Dixon</i>)	152
—	PENDLETON (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	448
—	JAMES ANDREWS and others (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	252
—	Inhabitants of DOVER, in public meeting as- sembled; (<i>Name illegible</i>), chairman (<i>Mr. Freshfield</i>)	1
—	— (<i>Mr. Freshfield</i>)	200
—	— (<i>Mr. Freshfield</i>)	76
—	DUBLIN (<i>Sir Arthur Guinness</i>)	724
—	ROSAMOND JANET COOK and others (<i>Lord Claud John Hamilton</i>)	70
—	Inhabitants of KIDDERMINSTER (<i>Mr. Charles Harrison</i>)	99
—	ASTON ROWANT (<i>Mr. Henley</i>)	40
—	Bedminster Ward, BRISTOL (<i>Mr. Kirkman Hodgson</i>)	792
—	Women of HACKNEY (<i>Mr. John Holms</i>)	346
—	Inhabitants of BELFAST (<i>Mr. Johnston</i>)	15
—	SCARBOROUGH (<i>Sir Harcourt Johnstone</i>)	90
—	PETERSFIELD, in public meeting assembled; Henry Elkington, chairman (<i>Captain Jolliffe</i>)	1
—	J. E. MATHEWS and others (<i>Lord Kensington</i>)	116
—	Inhabitants of PECKHAM and other places (<i>Sir James Lawrence</i>)	60
—	LONDONDERRY (<i>Mr. Charles Lewis</i>)	96
—	Members of the Arches Lodge of the Indepen- dent Order of Good Templars, LEITH; J. H. Smith, worthy chief templar; Marion Dove, worthy scribe (<i>Mr. Macgregor</i>)	2
—	Granton Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, LEITH; Archiebald McKelvie, worthy chief templar, and others (<i>Mr. Macgregor</i>)	3
—	Inhabitants of LEICESTER (<i>Lord John Manners</i>)	294
—	SHEFFIELD (<i>Mr. Mundella</i>)	154
—	WATLINGTON and neighbourhood (<i>Col. North</i>)	23
—	WEXFORD (<i>Mr. O'Conor</i>)	103
—	WOODFORD, in county of Essex (<i>Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson</i>)	201
—	CAMBRIDGE (<i>Mr. Smollett</i>)	50
—	BLACKHEATH, in public meeting assembled; J. F. Tidman, chairman (<i>Mr. J. Talbot</i>)	1
—	WANDSWORTH (<i>Mr. John Talbot</i>)	22

	June 23. MARCELLA MARMION, Blackrock (Col. Taylor)	1
	LOUISA WILSON, Bray, in the county of Dublin (Colonel Taylor)	1
	Inhabitants of DUBLIN (Colonel Taylor)	1,024
¶	— (Colonel Taylor)	510
¶	— (Colonel Taylor)	512
¶	— (Colonel Taylor)	135
¶	DUNDRUM, in the county of Dublin (Colonel Taylor)	54
¶	— (Colonel Taylor)	32
¶	BELFAST (Colonel Taylor)	103
¶	BLACKROCK (Colonel Taylor)	104
¶	WEXFORD (Colonel Taylor)	17
¶	LEEDS (Mr. Wheelhouse)	17
¶	Members of the Hope of LOUTH Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars; Ebenezer D. C. Cormick, deputy grand worthy chief templar, and others (Mr. Winn)	15
¶	Inhabitants of WHITTLESEA, in the county of Cambridge (Mr. Eliot Yorke)	6
¶	— PLYMOUTH	584
¶	— CHRISTCHURCH, in public meeting assembled; G. Marshall, chairman	1
¶	Members of Lodges of the Independent Order of Good Templars, PLYMOUTH	65
¶	18. Members of the LIGHTHOUSE LODGE of the Independent Order of Good Templars; W. Anderson, worthy chief templar; J. Gordon, worthy scribe (Mr. Macgregor)	2
¶	24. Inhabitants of LIBBERTON (Earl of Dalkeith)	167
¶	— DUDDINGTON (Earl of Dalkeith)	23
¶	MARY NICHOL, Saint Agnes, Libberton (Earl of Dalkeith)	1
¶	Inhabitants of HELENSBURG (Mr. Ewing)	95
¶	— HACKNEY (Mr. Fawcett)	166
¶	— CHELSEA (Mr. William Gordon)	1,492
¶	— BURY SAINT EDMUNDS (Lord Frederick Henry)	48
¶	— EXETER (Mr. Johnson)	571
¶	ANNIE D. MILLER and others (Sir James Lawrence)	8
¶	Inhabitants of HUDDERSFIELD (Mr. Leatham)	402
¶	— PLYMOUTH, in public meeting assembled; Isaac Latimer, chairman (Sir Massey Lopes)	1
¶	— LAMBETH, in public meeting assembled; D. Jeavons, chairman (Mr. William M'Arthur)	1
¶	JENNETTA OCTAVIA TEMPLE and others (Mr. Mills)	393
¶	Inhabitants of BELVEDERE, in the county of Kent (Sir Charles Mills)	52
¶	— PECKHAM RYE and other places (Sir Charles Mills)	20
¶	— LESSNESS HEATH, in the county of Kent (Sir Charles Mills)	53
¶	— SHEFFIELD, in public meeting assembled; S. Earnshaw, chairman (Mr. Mundella)	1

	June 24. Inhabitants of DUBLIN (Mr. O'Sullivan)	105
¶	— BLACKROCK, in the county of Dublin (Mr. O'Sullivan)	100
¶	— Members of the Blue Bell Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, BILSTON (Mr. Villiers)	25
¶	— Inhabitants of ANDOVER, in the county of Hants, in public meeting assembled; (Name illegible), chairman	1
¶	25. — CERES, in the county of Fife (Sir Robert Anstruther)	97
¶	— PINNER, in the county of Middlesex (Mr. Coope)	50
¶	— DROITWICH (Mr. Corbett)	75
¶	— MARYLEBONE (Mr. Forsyth)	1,968
¶	— CROYDON (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	53
¶	— GREENWICH (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	35
¶	— " (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	180
¶	— CRICKLADE (Mr. Goddard)	89
¶	— KINGSTOWN, in the county of Dublin (The O'Conor Don)	128
¶	— CHELMSFORD, in the county of Essex (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson)	2
¶	— " (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson)	80
¶	— DUDLEY, in the county of Worcester (Mr. Sheridan)	68
¶	— WINCHESTER (Mr. Simonds)	132
¶	— Members of the Border Chief Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, HAWICK; John Orr, worthy chief templar (Mr. Trevelyan)	1
¶	26. GEORGE W. KNIGHT and others (Mr. Forsyth)	231
¶	— Inhabitants of WATERFORD, in public meeting assembled; (Name illegible), mayor, chairman (Mr. Richard Power)	1
¶	— MERTHYR TYDFIL (Mr. Christopher Talbot)	75
¶	— DARTFORD, in the county of Kent (Mr. John Talbot)	305
¶	— ERITH and BELVEDERE (Mr. John Talbot)	385
¶	29. Members of the Charles Pease Lodge of Good Templars, MIDDLESBOROUGH (Mr. Bolckow)	23
¶	— Inhabitants of KENSINGTON and other places (Mr. Forsyth)	83
¶	— LEYTONSTONE and other places (Mr. Forsyth)	181
¶	— COLCHESTER (Mr. Learmonth)	38
¶	— WEST HARTLEPOOL (Mr. Richardson)	14
¶	— DUBLIN (Colonel Taylor)	117
¶	— BOOTERSTOWN (Colonel Taylor)	106
¶	— BLACKROCK (Colonel Taylor)	105
¶	30. — HACKNEY (Mr. Forsyth)	801
¶	— LONDON (Mr. Forsyth)	1,726
¶	— LAMBETH (Mr. Forsyth)	93
¶	— BLACKROCK, in the county of Dublin (Sir Arthur Guinness)	122
¶	— DUBLIN (Sir Arthur Guinness)	116

June 30.	Inhabitants of BUSHMILLS and DUNLUCE (<i>Mr. O'Neill</i>)	107
—	Good Templars of BATLEY, in the county of York (<i>Mr. Spencer Stanhope</i>) ...	33
¶ July 1.	Inhabitants of BATTERSEA (<i>Mr. Grantham</i>) ...	1,630
¶ —	KINGSTOWN, in the county of Dublin (<i>Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton</i>)	110
¶ —	BLACKROCK, in the county of Dublin (<i>Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton</i>)	210
¶ —	BOOTERSTOWN, in the county of Dublin (<i>Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton</i>)	40
¶ —	WEXFORD (<i>Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton</i>)	40
¶ —	Town Councillors of BATH (<i>Mr. Hayter</i>)	24
¶ —	Inhabitants of MALVERN (<i>Mr. Knight</i>)	23
¶ —	BLACKROCK, in the county of Dublin (<i>Colonel Taylor</i>)	122
¶ —	DUBLIN (<i>Colonel Taylor</i>)	115
—	2. Members of the Star Lodge of Good Templars, MIDDLESBOROUGH (<i>Mr. Bolckow</i>)	22
¶ —	Jehovah Jireh Lodge of Good Templars, NEWPORT, in the county of Monmouth (<i>Mr. Cordes</i>)	19
¶ —	Inhabitants of BARNSTAPLE (<i>Mr. Waddy</i>)	401
§ —	3. Members of the Municipal Corporation of SOUTHAMPTON (<i>Mr. Russell Gurney</i>) ...	Seal.
¶ —	Inhabitants of WINCHESTER (<i>Mr. Naghten</i>) ...	107
§ —	— in public meeting assembled; F. Moorhead, mayor, chairman (<i>Mr. Naghten</i>)	1
¶ —	L. ROBERTS and others (<i>Mr. Stansfeld</i>)	467
§ —	6. Women of HACKNEY, in meeting assembled; Louisa E. Wade, president (<i>Mr. Lusk</i>)	1
—	Inhabitants of TRANENT, in the county of Haddington (<i>Sir Henry Pelly</i>)	45
¶ —	DUBLIN (<i>Mr. Plunket</i>)	100
¶ —	7. R. D. HILTON and others (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	24
¶ —	Inhabitants of TOTTERDOWN, Bristol (<i>Mr. Morley</i>)	623
¶ —	SODSTON and other places (<i>Mr. Nevill</i>)	82
—	S. W. MURPHY, Bally Killane, in the county of Carlow (<i>The O'Conor Don</i>)	1
—	MARY FRASER, Ballyfarnon (<i>The O'Conor Don</i>)	1
—	C. MULVANY, Cardarney, in the county of Roscommon (<i>The O'Conor Don</i>)	1
—	Members of the Mount of Olives Lodge of Good Templars, BRADFORD (<i>Mr. Ripley</i>)	10
—	Inhabitants of HOLLOWAY (<i>Mr. Torrens</i>)	924
§ —	8. — BASINGSTOKE, in public meeting assembled; Arthur Waller, mayor, chairman (<i>Mr. Beach</i>)	1
—	DUBLIN (<i>Colonel Taylor</i>)	1,024
—	Professors and others of the University of CAMBRIDGE (<i>Mr. Spencer Walpole</i>)	72
—	9. Inhabitants of HACKNEY (<i>Mr. Fawcett</i>)	261
—	ENNISCORTHY (<i>Mr. O'Clery</i>)	110
—	BOOTERSTOWN (<i>Mr. O'Clery</i>)	106
¶ —	10. Women householders of LONDON (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	420

¶ July 13.	Inhabitants of HASTINGS, in the county of Sussex (<i>Mr. Thomas Brassey</i>)	48
¶ —	HASTINGS in the county of Sussex (<i>Mr. Thomas Brassey</i>)	48
¶ —	FOLESHILL, in the county of Warwick (<i>Mr. Newdegate</i>)	1,258
¶ —	LONDON (<i>Mr. Twells</i>)	575
—	14. — LEEDS (<i>Mr. Carter</i>)	372
¶ —	J. HORSFORD and others (<i>Mr. Locke</i>)	708
¶ —	Inhabitants of FINSBURY (<i>Mr. Lusk</i>)	3,781
—	WATERFORD (<i>Mr. Power</i>)	58
¶ —	LEEDS (<i>Mr. Wheelhouse</i>)	342
¶ —	15. — GREENWICH (<i>Mr. Boord</i>)	2,575
—	HUNSLET (<i>Mr. Carter</i>)	85
¶ —	CHELSEA (<i>Mr. William Gordon</i>)	606
¶ —	LONDON (<i>Mr. Goschen</i>)	882
¶ —	LAMBETH (<i>Mr. William M'Arthur</i>)	985
§ —	STANHOPE, in public meeting assembled; John Wharton, chairman (<i>Mr. Pease</i>)	1
¶ —	BATTERSEA (<i>Sir Henry Peek</i>)	2,544
¶ —	WESTMINSTER (<i>Sir Charles Russell</i>)	2,657
¶ —	LEEDS (<i>Mr. Tennant</i>)	324
—	(<i>Mr. Wheelhouse</i>)	8
¶ —	16. — WANDSWORTH (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	301
¶ —	LONDON (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	298
¶ —	(<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	1,583
¶ —	(<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	35
§ —	17. — HOLBEACH, in public meeting assembled; John S. Patchett, chairman (<i>Mr. Chaplin</i>)	1
¶ —	TIVERTON (<i>Mr. Massey</i>)	264
—	(<i>Mr. Massey</i>)	32
—	20. D. BLAKE and others (<i>Mr. Forsyth</i>)	41
¶ —	21. Inhabitants of HACKNEY (<i>Mr. Fawcett</i>)	1,773
§ —	22. — MEDOMSLEY, in the county of Durham, in public meeting assembled; John Weddle, chairman (<i>Major Beaumont</i>)	1
§ —	SHOTLEY BRIDGE, in public meeting assembled; W. Campbell, chairman (<i>Mr. Palmer</i>)	1
§ —	RUTHIN, in public meeting assembled; R. Ellis, chairman (<i>Mr. Williams</i>)	1
—	TIVERTON	223
§ —	27. — CROOK, in public meeting assembled; John Black, chairman (<i>Mr. Burt</i>)	1
—	ELIZABETH WALKER, 24, Clarence Street, Edinburgh (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	1
—	ELIZABETH HUNTER and MARGARET HUNTER, 5, Great Stuart Street, Edinburgh (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	2
—	MARGARET F. CAMPBELL, 1, Great Stuart Street, Edinburgh (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	1
—	E. MURRAY, 56, South Clerk Street, Edinburgh (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	1
—	JANE H. MAITLAND, 9, S.E. Circus Place, Edinburgh (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	1

July 27.	BARBARA JANE MURE, 25, Grange Road, Edinburgh (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	1
—	AGNES SPALDING, 22, Leamington Terrace, Edinburgh (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	1
—	MARGARET SCOTT, 100, George Street, Edinburgh (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	1
—	MARY M. JAMES, 34, Frederick Street, Edinburgh (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	1
—	CATHERINE R. SMITH, Hillside Cottage, Linlithgow (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	1
Aug. 3.	Inhabitants of ANDOVER (<i>Captain Wellesley</i>)...	43

Total number of Petitions 1,404—Signatures 430,343

WOMEN'S DISABILITIES BILL—AGAINST.

§ May 8.	Lord Provost, Magistrates, and Town Council of ELGIN (<i>Mr. Grant Duff</i>)	Seal. 1
§ — 11.	Provost, Magistrates, and Council of LINLITHGOW, in public meeting assembled (<i>Mr. Ramsay</i>)	Seal. 1

Total number of Petitions 2—Signatures 2

*The petitions marked ¶ have the addresses of some or all of the petitioners affixed.
The petitions marked § are signed officially.*

SUMMARY OF PETITIONS PRESENTED UP TO AUGUST 7th, 1874.

	No. of Petitions signed Officially or under Seal.	Total No. of Petitions.	Total No. of Signatures.
Women's Disabilities Bill—In favour	203	1,404	430,343
” ” ” Against	2	2	2



MR. FITZJAMES STEPHEN ON THE POSITION OF WOMEN.

Price Threepence.

MR. FITZJAMES STEPHEN

ON THE

POSITION OF WOMEN.

BY

MILLCENT GARRETT FAWCETT.



London :

MACMILLAN AND CO.

1873.

The following remarks appeared a few weeks ago in the "Examiner," as a review of part of Mr. F. Stephen's book called "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity."

At the request of some very friendly critics, I have had them reprinted in the form of a pamphlet.

M. G. F.

JULY, 1873.

MR. FITZJAMES STEPHEN ON THE POSITION OF WOMEN.

IN a book entitled "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," consisting chiefly of reprints from the *Pall Mall Gazette*, the English-speaking nations of the world have just received the latest revelation of the Gospel according to St. Stephen. Upon nearly all the most important subjects of contemporary politics, upon the gravest questions of religion and metaphysics, we are fully instructed what we ought to do, and how we ought to think. "This is the way, walk ye in it," ought to be printed in letters an inch high on the top of every page. The manner in which the law is laid down on such questions, for instance, as the connection of Church and State, the social position of women, the Parliamentary suffrage, and the right of the State to persecute, strikes one as not only clear, but loud. The reader feels as he studies these passages that the author is shouting in his ear. If, as is probable, he resents being bawled at, he may console himself with the reflection that Mr. Stephen would despise him as one of the bad results of modern civilization, a creature full of nervous sensibility, afraid of pain for

himself and others. We therefore advise him not to complain of the shock to his nerves, but to provide himself with a little cotton-wool.

It is impossible to consider here one quarter of the subjects dealt with in "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity." Even if the time and space at our disposal permitted it, our limited faculties render it impossible for us to follow Mr. Stephen into the heights and depths to which he would conduct his readers. We therefore propose to criticise only one portion of Mr. Stephen's book—that which refers to the position of women.

Mr. Stephen's case is this: Men are stronger than women in every shape. They have greater muscular and nervous force, greater intellectual force, greater vigour of character. The physical differences between men and women affect every part of the human body, from the hair of the head to the sole of the foot. This inequality ought to be recognised by the law and by society. Therefore the law and public opinion ought to make the man master; in married life, if differences of opinion arise between husband and wife—on such questions, for instance, as their place of residence or the education of their children—the will of the husband ought to be supreme: the duty of the wife is submission, even although she may disapprove the decision of her husband, and may be better able than he to come to a trustworthy judgment on the matter in hand. Mr. Stephen writes: "I say the wife ought to give way. She ought to obey her husband, and carry out the view at which he deliberately arrives, just as, when the captain gives the word to cut away the masts, the lieutenant carries out his orders at once, though he may be a better seaman and may disapprove them."

Mr. Stephen's theory is the theory of the common law. It will be remembered that this theory was maintained in a very remarkable manner at the trial

of Mrs. Torpey for robbery, and for smothering a jeweller's assistant with chloroform. The facts were proved against Mrs. Torpey, but she was acquitted because, in stupefying a young man and afterwards robbing him, she had done her duty as a wife. She had obeyed her husband, and carried out the view at which he had deliberately arrived. Mrs. Torpey might have been a person with the most delicate sense of honour, but the captain had given the word and the lieutenant had but to obey. Those who maintain the absolute authority of the husband must be prepared to meet cases of this kind. Is the wife to obey the husband when, in obeying him, she does something she believes to be wrong? If the answer is "yes," the possession of a husband may become the screen of all kinds of iniquity, from murder and robbery downwards. If the answer is "no," everything is conceded that the advocates of equality in marriage demand, for many wives may and do think it wrong to encourage a spirit of despotism in their husbands by invariably allowing the husband's authority to be supreme. We are very far, indeed, from wishing to imply that all men or all husbands have the spirit of despotism; but some men have it, and some women too, and we think it the duty of their friends and relations to check it by resistance before it becomes overpoweringly strong. Everyone must know domestic tyrants of both sexes who might have been immensely changed for the better if their disposition to insist invariably on their own way had been nipped in the bud. Mr. Stephen's simile is a great favourite with those who maintain the absolute authority of the husband in married life. The government of a family resembles, they say, the management of a vessel; in which everyone admits that it is necessary to maintain military discipline, and where the captain is entrusted with supreme and unques-

tioned authority, not only over the conduct of the vessel, but also over the liberty, and sometimes even over the lives, of every other person on the ship. There seems, however, to us to be a very remote analogy between the relations subsisting between a captain and lieutenant of a ship, and those between a husband and wife. Except under circumstances of very great emergency, a lieutenant could scarcely venture to offer advice to his captain unsolicited. The security which the officers, passengers, and crew have against abuse of authority on the part of the captain is, that they are able to report any cases of misconduct to the owners of the ship at the end of the voyage, or, as a less extreme measure, to refuse to serve or sail under the same captain on another voyage. We never heard anyone propose to give a similar remedy against oppression to the wives and children of tyrannical husbands.

No true analogy exists between the government of a ship and the government of a family. There is, however, a real resemblance between the government of a family and parliamentary government, as it exists in this country. In constitutional government no one person, no one chamber, has absolute authority; no change can be effected in the law without the consent of the three estates of the realm. We are constantly being told that the State is founded on the family; and we are certainly of the opinion that in the family, as in the State, it should be necessary to obtain the consent of the husband and the wife, who in this case stand for the two chambers, for any change affecting the interests of the whole family. As the children grow up, they too should be admitted to the family parliament, and their advice and consent should be sought before the parents decide any matter of importance. Everyone must know plenty of instances of this kind of family government; and

nearly everyone will admit that in practice it contrasts favourably with the ship-captain kind of family government. The law sanctions the ship-captain theory, but the moral sentiment of many persons is superior to the law, and therefore there are many happy marriages. If the existing state of things were as bad as the laws relating to marriage would permit it to be, society would be, as Mr. Mill has said, "a hell upon earth." From this proposition Mr. Stephen strongly dissents. "I say," . . . he writes, "the law is good, and the people in question (those who have married happily) obey it." And yet he admits in a previous page that in many particulars men have made laws for their own supposed advantage, as husbands, which are in fact greatly to the injury of both men and women; and he goes on to speak of the "stupid coarseness of the laws about the effects of marriage on property." Mr. Stephen has, in fact, made a decided improvement on the spelling-book story, beginning, "I once knew a very nice little girl; she was cross, and told fibs." "The laws regulating the relations between men and women are very good; they are in many important respects injurious to both parties, partial, coarse, and stupid."

To illustrate the necessity of the legal supremacy of the husband, and also, we suppose, the position of a wife in her husband's house, Mr. Stephen describes the position of guests in a well-appointed house, and of clerks in a Government office. An "exact parallel to the case of married life is to be found in the common case of hospitality." "Everyone is anxious to promote the enjoyment of others; the host considers everyone before himself, but he has an undoubted legal right to order all his guests out of the house in the middle of the night—to forbid them to touch an article of furniture, or to eat a crumb of bread. This appears harsh; yet if he were deprived of that

right, if the presence of his guests rendered its existence doubtful for a moment in any particular, not one of them would cross his doors; matters go well, not because the master of the house has no powers, but because no one questions them, and he wishes to use them for the general comfort of the society." Mr. Stephen's other parallel is that of the contract a man makes to serve the Government on certain terms. In this case the employer has complete control over the employed; there is in this contract, as in the contract of marriage, a weaker and a stronger person, and the weaker is subject to the authority of the stronger.

The obvious reply to the argument based on these illustrations is that the guests and that the Government clerk are free to go the moment that the powers possessed by the host or by the employer are unfairly exercised. If the owner of a country-house, unprovoked by any ill-conduct on the part of his guests, availed himself of the powers so graphically described by Mr. Stephen, his guests would instantly take their departure; no one who knew the circumstance would ever stay with him; he would be looked upon as a madman, he would be cut by all his neighbours, and after his death his will would probably be disputed on the ground of his insanity. Even a slight ostentation of his authority as master of the house would probably be sufficient to hasten the departure of his guests, and would prevent their making him another visit. The clerk in a Government office is likewise free to go if there is any abuse of authority on the part of his superiors. Such an abuse of authority would also give the office a bad name, and would tend to prevent men who had any self-respect from becoming clerks in it.

If these parallels are "exact," Mr. Stephen ought to wish a wife to have the same means of escape from an abuse of authority as guests and clerks have. This

means they have not. The indissolubility of marriage renders all these so-called parallels entirely fallacious, and makes it necessary for the protection of the wife that she should not be either actually or legally subjugated to her husband. Every one of Mr. Stephen's parallels, including that of the ship captain, leads to the conclusion from which he would shrink, as much as we do, that the marriage contract should cease to be permanent.

Mr. Stephen is desirous to make his readers believe that the laws regulating the relations of men and women are very advantageous to the latter. Women, it is true, are subjugated to men, but then in return they get the protection of men. "Submission and protection are correlative. Withdraw the one and the other is lost, and force will assert itself a hundred times more harshly through the law of contract than ever it did through the law of status." That is to say, in return for submission married women get the protection of losing all control over their own property; they also have the inestimable advantage of possessing no legal right to the guardianship of their own children even after the death of their husbands. In return for the submissiveness of women, little girls of twelve years old are, for purposes of seduction, legally regarded as women—a most noteworthy instance, this, of the kind of protection the present state of the law affords. With regard to the protection women enjoy through the administration of the law, it is notorious that brutal assaults upon women are often treated with the most extraordinary leniency. In case any of our readers should imagine that we are prejudiced on this subject, we will quote from an article which appeared in the *Times* in April 1872:—"Every day the reports of our police courts and of our criminal tribunals still repeat the tale of savage and cowardly outrages upon women: and every day

we have reason to marvel, not without a mixture of indignation, at the leniency with which some of our judges treat offences of this kind. Let it be remembered that the decisions of our tribunals have much to do in forming the opinion of those who possess but little mental or moral training in regard to the comparative heinousness of crimes. . . . The only moral teaching which at present effectually enters into the conduct of a 'London rough' is that which he learns before the magistrate and the judge. What, then, is likely to be the effect upon his mind of a series of sentences which prove to him that for one in his position it is safer to disfigure or maim, or even trample the life out of a wretched woman who, in her folly, not unmixed with tenderness, may have linked her life to his, than to snatch a watch-chain from an old gentleman in a crowd, or to filch a few pounds of old metal from a workshop? Yet this is the lesson which is taught almost daily in our criminal courts. . . . Cases that were tried last week in our criminal courts might make us doubt whether some of our judges do not still hold to the principle that an Englishman may do what he likes with his own; and, within certain limits, may beat his wife as much as he pleases. Nay, it seems as though, if by accident apparently, he should a little overstep the limits of his manly privilege, and by such a chance relieve himself of an uncongenial companion, the courts will not too harshly scrutinise his conduct." The article then describes in detail cases of the most brutal outrage upon women, in several of which the victim, fortunately for herself, was killed, and for which the culprits received sentences of three or four months' hard labour. The *Times* concludes by demanding why a quasi-legality unrecognised by the law should be given to outrages upon women. In another article in the same journal, in August 1872, the complaint is

reiterated that "recent trials have revealed a prevalent indifference to the maltreatment of women, which is a heinous disgrace to English nature."

The subjects to which reference has just been made indicate the nature of the protection which women receive in return for their submission to men. But Mr. Stephen would probably admit that in these cases women are treated with something less than justice. He would, however, urge upon our consideration the courtesy with which well-bred men always treat well-bred women; he makes special mention of "the cheerful concessions to acknowledged weakness, the obligation to do for women a thousand things which it would be insulting to offer to do for a man." We wish Mr. Stephen had not in this part of his essay employed such general language; he can at times be explicit enough. What are these cheerful concessions to acknowledged weakness, and the thousand things that men do for women which it would be insulting to offer to do for a man? We are convinced that Mr. Stephen must refer to very important and substantial privileges, for he speaks as though their proper price was the subjection of women to men; but for the life of us we cannot think of anything but such matters as being "seen home" from evening parties, being helped first at dinner, having chairs offered, doors opened, umbrellas carried, and the like. For such privileges as these women of the middle class make what we always thought an ample return by sewing on buttons, working slippers, and making puddings for the man-kind of their domestic circles. Probably all women give back in small services of some kind the full value of the little attentions they receive as women from men. But even if this is not the case, it is a small consolation for Nancy Jones, in Whitechapel, who is kicked and beaten at discretion by her husband, to know that Lady Jones, in Belgravia, is always assisted

WOMAN SUFFRAGE:

A REPLY.

LONDON:
R. CLAY, SONS, AND TAYLOR, PRINTERS,
BREAD STREET HILL.

BY

J. E. CAIRNES, LL.D.,

EMERITUS PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL ECONOMY IN UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LONDON.

REPRINTED FROM MACMILLAN'S MAGAZINE, SEPTEMBER, 1874.

MANCHESTER:
ALEXANDER IRELAND & CO., PALL MALL.
1874.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE: A REPLY.

THE recent utterance of Mr. Goldwin Smith against Woman Suffrage has been for many friends of the cause, it may be confessed, a painful surprise. It seemed strange and almost portentous that the voice which had been so often, so boldly, and so eloquently raised on behalf of Liberal principles, should suddenly be heard issuing from the Conservative camp, in opposition to a measure which many Liberals regard as amongst the most important of pending reforms. No one, however, who has read Mr. Smith's essay will have any doubt that the opinions expressed in it—urged as they are with all his characteristic energy—are as genuine and sincere as anything he has ever written on the Liberal side. Whether he has made any converts to his views amongst the supporters of the movement he has attacked, is more than I can say; but as one of those who have not been convinced by his reasonings, I wish to state in what they seem to me to be unsatisfactory, and why, having given them my best consideration, I still remain in my former state of mind.

There is one portion of Mr. Smith's remarks into which, I may as well say here at the outset, I do not propose to follow him. I refer to what he has said of Mr. Mill's relations with his wife, and of his estimate of her mental powers. These are points respecting which, in my opinion, the data do not exist, at least within reach of the general public, for

forming a trustworthy opinion. They are, moreover, absolutely irrelevant to the practical controversy, which should be decided, as Mr. Smith himself in his essay confesses, "on its merits," "the interest of the whole community" being the test, and not by what people may think as to the life and opinions of any individual, however eminent. Further, their discussion cannot but inflict the keenest pain on more than one living person, who, from the nature of the case, are precluded from defending those whom they hold dear. To employ such arguments, therefore, is to use poisoned shafts; and I should have thought that Mr. Goldwin Smith would be about the last man living to resort to such modes of warfare.

Nor is this the only topic introduced by Mr. Smith into this discussion, which might, if not with advantage, at least without detriment to his argument, have been omitted. In his criticism of Mr. Mill's view of the historical origin of the present disabilities of women, there is much the connection of which with the practical question now before the English public it is not very easy to discern. When indeed Mr. Mill first took the question up, the discussion of this aspect of the case was imperatively demanded; because the thing then to be done was, not simply to find arguments to prove the expediency of admitting women to the suffrage, but first of all, and most difficult of all, to gain a hearing for his cause—to make some impression on the solid mass of prejudice that was arrayed against any consideration of the subject; and this could only be done by showing the factitious nature of the existing relation of the sexes. Accordingly, Mr. Mill addressed himself to this task, and in his work on the 'Subjection of Women,' deduced their disabilities from that primitive condition of the human race in which man employed his superior physical strength to coerce woman to his will. Such being the origin of the subjection of women, the disabilities complained of Mr. Mill regarded as, in ethnological phrase, "survivals" from a state of society in which physical force was supreme. To this explanation Mr.

Smith demurs, and contends that the "lot of the woman has not been determined by the will of the man, at least in any considerable degree." According to him it had its origin in those circumstances which made it expedient, on public grounds, that in the early stages of civilization the family should be socially, legally, and politically a unit. Into this portion of the controversy, however, I cannot see that there would be any advantage in entering. Whether Mr. Mill was right or wrong in his view of the historical question, he was at all events eminently successful in the purpose for which he introduced the discussion. He has secured a hearing for the cause of woman, so effectually, that we may now at least feel confident that it will not be ultimately decided on other grounds than those of reason and justice. Nor does it in truth matter whether in approaching the question of Woman Suffrage we adopt Mr. Mill's or Mr. Smith's theory. Both alike regard the existing disabilities of women as "survivals"—Mr. Mill, as survivals from a very early period in which physical force was supreme; Mr. Smith as survivals from the state of things which produced the peculiar constitution of the patriarchal family; but both as survivals, and therefore as belonging to a condition of life which has passed away. The point is thus of purely archæological interest, while the real question now before the public is, not as to the origin of woman's disabilities, but as to their present expediency; "the interest of the whole community," to borrow once more Mr. Smith's language, being "the test."

In the Bill lately before Parliament the intention of the framers, as the reader is aware, was to confer the suffrage on widows and spinsters only; married women having been expressly excluded from its operation. Mr. Smith, in entering on the discussion, is naturally anxious to deal with the question in its broadest form, and accordingly declines to be bound by this limited conception of it. He may be perfectly justified in this course; but the reasons given by him for extending the scope of the controversy are by no means convincing. To say that "marriage could hardly be treated as

politically penal" is to put the argument for his view into a neat phrase; but Englishmen have not hitherto been much governed by phrases, and I hope they are not now going to begin to be. The political disqualification which attaches to the military and naval services, as well as to some branches of the civil service, might also be described as a "penal" incident of those honourable callings, but it is nevertheless maintained; and I have no doubt that if people come to believe that it is advantageous to give the suffrage to widows and spinsters, but disadvantageous to extend it to married women, they will set epigrams at defiance, and draw the line exactly where it is drawn in Mr. Forsyth's Bill. Again, I deny altogether that there is anything in the logic of the case that would compel those who have given the suffrage to women, to take the further step of admitting them to Parliament. "Surely," says Mr. Smith, "she who gives the mandate is competent herself to carry it"—on the principle, I suppose, that—

"Who drives fat oxen should himself be fat."

But granting, for argument's sake, that she is competent to carry *her own* mandate, it still does not follow that she is competent to carry the mandates of *other people*; and this is what the right to a seat in Parliament means. Indeed it is only quite lately that the law has ceased to distinguish between the right to vote and the right to be elected;* and if the distinction no longer exists, its abolition has been due, not in the least to a desire for logical consistency, but simply to the fact that the qualification required by the law for a seat in Parliament was found in practice ineffective for its purpose and in other ways mischievous. If it prove on full examination that the character and circumstances of women are such as to render their admission to Parliament unadvisable on public grounds, those who are in favour of giving them the suffrage will be perfectly within their right in taking their stand at this point, and in refusing to grant them

* In the case of clergymen, as well as in other cases, the distinction is still maintained.

the larger concession. For my own part, as I do not believe that any detriment would come from including married women with others in the grant of the suffrage, or from the admission of women to Parliament, I am quite willing to argue the question on the broader ground on which Mr. Smith desires to place it.*

The most important argument advanced by Mr. Smith against the policy under consideration is contained in the following passages:—"The question whether Female Suffrage on an extended scale is good for the whole community is probably identical, practically speaking, with the question whether it is good for us to have free institutions or not. Absolute monarchy is founded on personal loyalty. Free institutions are founded on the love of liberty, or, to speak more properly, on the preference of legal to personal government. But the love of liberty and the desire of being governed by law alone appear to be characteristically male" (p. 145). From this position Mr. Smith concludes that "to give women the franchise is simply to give them the power of putting an end actually and virtually to all franchises together." "It may not be easy," he allows, "to say beforehand what course the demolition of free institutions by Female Suffrage would take." "But," he holds, "there can be little doubt that in all cases, if power were put into the hands of the women, free government, and with it liberty of opinion, would fall."

It cannot be denied that the consequences here indicated as likely to follow from the extension of the suffrage to women are sufficiently serious; and we may admit that a

* I cannot, however, go the length that Mr. Smith appears inclined to go in one passage, where he argues, or seems to argue, that all who are in favour of woman suffrage, are bound by their own principles to vote, under all circumstances, for woman candidates. He would scarcely, I presume, contend that all who are in favour of Catholic Emancipation are bound, when a Catholic offers himself, to vote for one; and, similarly, that those who favour Jewish Emancipation are bound, when they can, to vote for Jews; but, unless he is prepared to go this length, on what ground does he hold that the advocates of woman suffrage in America must, "if they had considered the consequences of their own principles," have voted for Mrs. Victoria Woodhull?

better reason could not easily be imagined for withholding anything from anybody than that its concession "would probably overturn the institutions on which the hopes of the world rest." But the greatness of a fear does not prove that it rests on solid grounds; and when we come to examine the grounds of Mr. Smith's dark forebodings, we find them about as substantial as the stuff that dreams are made of. "The female need of protection," he says, "of which, so long as women remain physically weak, and so long as they are mothers, it will be impossible to get rid, is apparently accompanied by a preference for personal government." "Women are priest-ridden;" but this does not go to the root of the "reactionary tendency characteristic of the sex." The effect of those physical and physiological peculiarities is, Mr. Smith thinks, to give "an almost uniform bias to the political sentiments of women;" this bias being opposed to law and liberty, and in favour of personal government; so that women may be trusted, whenever an opportunity offers, to act *en masse* for the destruction of free institutions.

Women in these passages are spoken of as if, so to speak, *in vacuo*: it is not to the women of any particular country or age that the description applies, but to woman in the abstract. In conformity with this, the illustrations which follow are taken by Mr. Smith from various ages and countries—I should have said with tolerable impartiality, if it were not that, strangely enough, scarcely any reference is made to the women of modern England. And yet it is the women of modern England whose case is in issue. Now this is a point of some importance; because it is quite possible, at least as I regard it—not being a believer in "natural rights"—that the suffrage may be a good thing for women in certain stages of social progress, as for men, but a bad thing for both where the social conditions are different. This being so, it is not obvious how Mr. Smith helps the intelligent discussion of the question by taking his examples at random from ancient Rome, Italy, France, the United States, England in the seventeenth century—in a word, from any source where

he can find cases to suit his purpose, but without the least reference to the special circumstances of each case. I have no desire to restrict unduly the range of the discussion; but I think that, when examples are taken from foreign countries, and still more when they are taken from former ages, with a view to prejudice the claims of Englishwomen to the franchise, some attempt should be made to show that the cases cited are really pertinent to the question in hand.

Turning, then, to the persons and country immediately concerned, let us consider how far the state of things here affords any support to Mr. Smith's speculations. I will not attempt to deny that there may be priest-ridden women in England, possibly in considerable numbers; nor will I dispute what some well-informed persons have asserted, that the passing of a Woman Suffrage Bill would not improbably, at all events for a time, give an accession of political influence to the clergy. But granting this, and even conceding, for the sake of argument, Mr. Smith's theory as to the natural bias of the female mind, we are still a long way off from the terrible catastrophe that his fears portend. "Female Suffrage," he says, "would give a vast increase of power to the clergy;" but we have still to ask if the English clergy, Church and Nonconformist, are, as a body, ready to join in a crusade against free institutions. I am quite unable to discover what the grounds are for such a supposition; but if this cannot be assumed, then their influence would not be exercised in the direction Mr. Smith apprehends, and his fears for free institutions are groundless. Even if we were to make the extravagant supposition that the clergy are to a man in favour of personal government and absolutism, there would still be husbands, fathers, and brothers, whose appeals on behalf of free government would not surely pass altogether unheeded. Is it being over-sanguine to assume that at the worst a sufficient number of women would be kept back from the polls to leave the victory with the cause that is "characteristically male?"

In short, we have only to attempt to realise the several

conditions, *all of which would need to be fulfilled before the catastrophe which Mr. Smith dreads could even be approached*, in order to perceive the extravagant improbability, if not intrinsic absurdity, of his apprehensions. But instead of attempting to follow further the possible consequences of social and political combinations which are never likely to have any existence outside Mr. Smith's fancy, let us consider for a moment the theory he has advanced as to the mental constitution of women, which lies at the bottom of the whole speculation. Women, it seems, are so constituted by nature as to be incapable of the "love of liberty, and the desire of being governed by law;" and this results from a "sentiment inherent in the female temperament, formed by the normal functions and circumstances of the sex." Now if this be so—if the sentiments of women with regard to government and political institutions are thus determined by physiological causes too powerful to be modified by education and experience, then those sentiments would in all countries and under all conditions of society be essentially the same. But is this the fact? On the contrary, is it not matter of common remark that the whole attitude of women towards politics is strikingly different in different countries; that it is one thing in England, another in the United States, something different from either in France and Italy, and something different from all in Turkey and the East? and, not to travel beyond the range of the present controversy, do we not find within the United Kingdom almost every variety of political opinion prevailing amongst women, according to the circumstances of their education and social surroundings? It may be true that the interest taken by women in politics has hitherto been in general somewhat languid; that, as a body, they are less alive than men to the advantages of political liberty and of legal government. But is not this precisely what was to be expected, supposing their political opinions to be subject to the same influences which determine the political opinions of men? As a rule they have from the beginning of things been excluded from politics; their whole education

has been contrived, one might say, with the deliberate purpose of giving to their sentiments an entirely different bent; home and private life have been inculcated on them as the only proper sphere for their ambition; yet in spite of these disadvantages, by merely mixing in society with men who take an interest in politics, a very great number of women have come to share that interest, while there are some, as Mr. Smith admits—I will add a rapidly increasing number—"eminently capable of understanding and discussing political questions." Can it be said that of the women who in this country take an interest in politics the bias of their political sentiments is uniformly in one direction, and this—the direction of personal government and absolutism? I can only say, if this be Mr. Smith's experience, it is singularly different from mine. No doubt there are women in abundance who care nothing for politics, and who would be quite content to live under any government which offered a fair promise of peace and security; but may not precisely the same be said of no inconsiderable number of men even in England? Would it not be easy to find men enough, and these by no means amongst the residuum, who take no interest at all in politics, and who, so far as they are concerned, would be willing to hand over the destinies of the human race to-morrow to a Cæsar, or to any one else who, they had reason to believe, would maintain the rights of property, and keep their own precious persons safe? This state of feeling amongst some men is not considered to prove that men in general are unfitted by nature for the functions of citizenship under a free government; and when we meet exactly the same phenomenon amongst women, why are we to deduce from it a conclusion which in the case of men we should repudiate?

In short, the patent facts of experience in this country (and if here or anywhere the facts are as I have stated them, they suffice to dispose of Mr. Smith's theory) are consistent with one supposition and with one supposition only—the existence in women of political capabilities which may be

developed in almost any direction, according to the nature of the influences brought to bear upon them. It may very well be that, when experience has furnished us with sufficient data for observation, a something will prove to be discernible in the political opinions of the two sexes in the nature of a characteristic quality; but at present conjecture upon this subject is manifestly premature; and Mr. Smith's arrow, apparently shot at a venture, we may confidently say, has not hit the mark. The love of liberty and the desire of being governed by law are feelings which have as yet been developed in but a very small proportion of men; they have been developed in a still smaller proportion of women, but the difference is not greater than the difference in the education and circumstances of the two sexes is amply sufficient to account for.

Mr. Smith having thoroughly frightened himself by the chimeras his imagination had conjured up as the probable result of giving the Suffrage to Women, puts the question:—"But would the men submit?" and he resorts to an ingenious, though perhaps questionable, speculation on the ultimate sanctions of law, to show that they would not. If the laws passed by women were such as men disapproved of, "the men," he says, "would, of course, refuse execution; law would be set at defiance, and government would be overturned" (p. 146). When, therefore, "the female vote" came to be taken "on the fate of free institutions," and the decree for their abolition went forth, it seems that, after all, it would prove mere *brutum fulmen*. The consummation would never take place; and the institutions on which the hopes of the world rest would remain erect, unharmed amid the impotent feminine rage surging around, much (if one may venture on a profane illustration) like one of those gin palaces in the United States that has held its ground against the psalmody of the whisky crusaders. One would have thought that this reflection would have brought some solace to Mr. Smith's soul; but, strange to say, he regards it as an aggravation of the impending evils; and would apparently

be better pleased if, in the supposed contingency, men in general should exhibit the same implicit subserviency which, he tells us, has been shown by a man, somewhere in the United States, who, under his wife's compulsion, is in the habit of working for her as a hired labourer—a fact, by the way, not very happily illustrating his theory of the ultimate sanctions of law.

In truth this portion of Mr. Smith's argument—and it is in a logical sense the very heart of his case, in such sort, that, this part failing, the whole collapses—is so utterly—I will not say, weak—but so utterly unlike the sort of argument ordinarily to be found in his political writings, that it is difficult to resist the impression that it does not represent the real grounds of his conviction, but is rather a theory excogitated after conviction to satisfy that intellectual craving which an opinion formed on other grounds than reason invariably produces. And this impression is confirmed, if not reduced to certainty, as we continue the perusal of his essay. In an early passage Mr. Smith had told us that he "himself once signed a petition for Female Household Suffrage got up by Mr. Mill;" adding that, when he signed it, he "had not seen the public life of women in the United States." Further on he gives us an account of this public life, as he conceives it; and I have no doubt that we have here disclosed to us the real source, if not of his present opinions on Woman Suffrage, at least of the intensity with which they are held. In the United States, he says, "a passion for emulating the male sex has undoubtedly taken possession of some of the women, as it took possession of women under the Roman empire, who began to play the gladiator when other excitements were exhausted." It seems further that there are women in the United States who claim, "in virtue of 'superior complexity of organisation,' not only political equality but absolute supremacy over man, of whom one has given to the movement the name of the 'Revolt of Woman.'" Again, "in the United States the privileges of women may be said to extend to impunity, not only for ordinary outrage,

but for murder. The poisoner whose guilt has been proved by overwhelming evidence, is let off because she is a woman; there is a sentimental scene between her and her advocate in court, and afterwards she appears as a public lecturer.* The Whisky Crusade shows that women are practically above the law." Once more it appears that "in the United States the grievance of which most is heard is the tyrannical stringency of the marriage tie. . . . Some of the language used . . . if reproduced might unfairly prejudice the case." Already "male legislatures in the United States have carried the liberty of divorce so far, that the next step would be the total abolition of marriage and the destruction of the family;" and this is followed by a story of "a woman who accomplished a divorce by simply shutting the door of the house, which was her own property, in her husband's face." It would be easy, had I space at my command, to add to these extracts; but the foregoing will suffice. One is led to ask what is the bearing of such statements, assuming the facts to be all correctly given, upon the question of Woman Suffrage? Mr. Smith has not troubled himself to point this out—apparently has never

* Mr. Smith gives neither dates nor places, but there can be little doubt that in the allusion in the text two distinct transactions are confounded: the inference suggested, moreover, is such as the facts by no means warrant. "The poisoner whose guilt has been proved by overwhelming evidence," but who is "let off," must, I think, refer to the case of a woman tried some time ago in one of the eastern cities, I think Baltimore. It is true she was "let off," but, as an American barrister informs me, with perfect propriety; the evidence against her not being sufficient to sustain the charge. In this case there was no sentimental scene in court, and no appearance afterwards as a public lecturer. These latter incidents belong to a case which occurred in San Francisco, in which a woman, Laura Fair by name, was tried, not for poisoning, but for shooting her paramour in the open street, and was acquitted in the face of the most conclusive evidence. The advocate, however, as I am informed, was passive in "the sentimental scene," and afterwards sued the lady for his fees. It is true, too, that she appeared shortly afterwards as a public lecturer; but Mr. Smith omits to add—what is surely pertinent to the question in hand—that she was hooted by the audience from the platform, and found it prudent to leave the town without delay. No one who knows anything of the United States would regard San Francisco as a typical American city; it is rather an extreme example of all that is most pronounced in American rowdyism; yet even in San Francisco we find that popular feeling on the immunity of women from penalties for crime is something very different from what Mr. Smith represents it.

considered it; but finds it simpler to throw in such sensational allusions here and there as a sort of garnishing for his argument, trusting no doubt that they will produce upon the minds of his readers the same impression which they have evidently made upon his own. The case seems to be this:—Mr. Smith's finer susceptibilities have been rudely shocked by the antics of a sort of Mænad sisterhood holding their revels here and there in the vast territory of the United States; and a state of mind has supervened which leads him to regard with disfavour any cause with which these women happen to be associated. Woman Suffrage, unfortunately, is one of those causes; and therefore Mr. Smith is opposed to Woman Suffrage.

Now, to let one's opinions be formed in this way is not to be guided by experience, as some people would have us believe. Let not anyone suppose that Mr. Smith has any such solid support for the views advanced in his essay. Woman Suffrage has nowhere yet, out of Utah, been tried in the United States; whereas we in England have witnessed its working at least in our municipal and school-board elections. In point of experience, therefore, we who have remained at home have the advantage of Mr. Smith. His sojourn in America, however, has brought to his notice the sort of women—or, more properly, a sort of women—who contrive to make themselves conspicuous in the United States in social and political agitations. It may be allowed that, as depicted by him, they are not a gracious band; though hardly less attractive than some of the male politicians who figure at Caucuses, Rings, and other political gatherings in the same country. Is Mr. Smith, in disgust at this latter product of American institutions, prepared to abolish male suffrage, and with it representative government—to abolish it not merely in the United States, but here and everywhere? for to this length does his argument against Woman Suffrage, drawn from analogous manifestations on the part of some American women, carry him.

As I have said, Mr. Smith has not pointed out the bearing

of his sensational allusions on the question of Woman Suffrage. If he intended them to support his case he was undoubtedly prudent in not doing so. Let us consider one or two of them in connection with the question at issue. We are told, for example, that "in the United States the privileges of women may be said to extend to impunity, not only for ordinary outrage, but for murder;" and then comes the story of the poisoner which I have examined in a note. Further on he says, "if the women ask for the suffrage, say some American publicists, they must have it; and in the same way, everything that a child cries for is apt to be given it without reflection as to the consequences of the indulgence." Now, assuming (what I am by no means disposed to admit) that the state of feeling towards women in the United States is such as these remarks suggest, it is to be observed in the first place that it is a state of feeling which has grown up, not under a female, but under an exclusively male, suffrage, and it is not easy to believe that the extension of the suffrage to women could make it worse. In the next place, the feeling in question is merely an exaggeration of that sickly sentimentalism regarding woman and all that concerns her which has come down to us from times of chivalry, and which has hitherto been fostered by the careful exclusion of women from political life, as well as from the great majority of useful and rational occupations. In the United States, a portion of the women appear, from Mr. Smith's account, to have suddenly broken loose from many of these restraints; and the use they are making of their freedom appears to be about as wise and edifying as the use which men commonly make of political freedom when it has been suddenly conferred upon them after centuries of servitude. The sentiment deserves all the scorn that Mr. Smith pours upon it; but the corrective for it, if it exists, is not to be found in a continuance of the state of things which produced it, but in opening to women those spheres of action from which they have been hitherto debarred, and in subjecting them to the free and bracing air of equality, alike in rights and in responsibilities, with men.

And this consideration furnishes the answer to another of Mr. Smith's arguments. He considers that the admission of women to the suffrage, instead of mitigating, is likely to aggravate the violence of political strife, and in support of this view refers to the Reign of Terror, the revolt of the Commune, and the American Civil War. I must own this latter reference has taken me by surprise. I have never heard before that the women of the United States during the civil war "notoriously rivalled the men in fury and atrocity." I remember some very great atrocities committed during that war; for example, the massacre at Fort Pillow, the treatment of prisoners of war in some of the Southern military hospitals, the attempts to burn down some of the public buildings and hotels in New York; but these were all committed by men, and I have never heard of similar acts committed or attempted by American women. If Mr. Smith knows of any such, he ought to enlighten the world by stating them, or else withdraw his injurious assertion. On the other hand, I have heard, and I imagine so must Mr. Smith, of the magnificent devotion to their country shown by the women of the Northern States in organising and working hospital corps, and in actual services rendered to the wounded on the field, mitigating thus the hardships and horrors of war in a manner to reflect honour on their country and on their sex. As to the women of the Reign of Terror and the Commune, they were, at all events, not worse than the men; and the shocking crimes committed by both, so far as they are not purely mythical, are, no doubt, referable to the same causes—the tremendous excitement of the time, the wild doctrines current, and, above all, the absolute inexperience in political affairs of those to whom power for the moment fell.

Again, what is the bearing of Mr. Smith's statements regarding the great freedom of divorce existing in some of the States of the Union? "Male legislators," it seems, "have already carried the liberty of divorce so far that the next step would be the total abolition of marriage and the

destruction of the family." Does it follow from this that female, or rather mixed, legislatures would go further in the same direction? for this seems to be the drift of this portion of Mr. Smith's remarks. In an earlier part of his essay he had told us that it was inherent in the nature of women to be subservient to the clergy: he now suggests that, if admitted to the suffrage, they would probably enact the abrogation of the marriage tie. Perhaps he sees his way to reconciling these two opinions, but it is not obvious on the surface, any more than it is easy to reconcile the latter with what he tells us a few lines lower down, that women have a far deeper interest in maintaining the stringency of the marriage tie than men. If so, then, one naturally asks, why will they not use their influence to maintain it? Are they such imbeciles as not to discern their interest in so important a matter, or, discerning it, to throw their weight into the scale adverse to their most vital concerns? Here again Mr. Smith answers himself: he tells us, "the women themselves [I presume the Mænads] have now, it is said, begun to draw back."

I now turn to a side of the question on which Mr. Smith lays very great stress, and of which I am not in the least disposed to underrate the importance—the extension of the suffrage to married women. I do not yield to Mr. Smith, or to anyone, in the firmness of my conviction that the family is at the bottom of our existing civilization, and I should, for my part, regard as dearly purchased any gain in material or political well-being which should introduce a jar or weakness into this pivot of our social system. But I believe that to open political life to women, far from being fraught with the disastrous consequences Mr. Smith anticipates, would, taking things in their entire scope, be productive of quite opposite effects. If I were asked to name the principal element of weakness in the family as things now stand, I should have no hesitation in pointing to the want of sufficient subjects of common interest between man and woman. It is owing to this that matrimonial engagements are entered into so rarely

on the basis of any broad intellectual sympathy, such as might furnish some security for lasting affection, and so often at the bidding of impulses and fancies that do not outlive the honeymoon; and it is owing to the same cause that so very large a proportion of the lives of most husbands and wives are spent practically apart, with little or no knowledge on the part of either of the objects or aims that engross the greater portion of the other's thoughts and energies. That under such circumstances the marriage tie is, on the whole, maintained as well as it is, seems rather matter for wonder; and to argue that the introduction of a new source of very profound common interest for husband and wife must of necessity weaken the bond, is, in my opinion, to evince a singular inability to appreciate the real dangers now besetting the institution. It is true, no doubt, that every new subject of common interest for husband and wife, must, from the nature of the case, constitute also a new possible occasion for disagreement; but if this is to be accounted a good reason for excluding women from politics, they might with equal justice be excluded from literature, from the fine arts, from everything in which men also take an interest—above all from religion. The value of these several pursuits as bonds and cements of married life is just in proportion to the degree of common interest which husbands and wives take in them, and just in the same proportion also is the possible danger that they may become the grounds of dissension. Mr. Smith is greatly scandalised at the prospect of a man and his wife taking opposite sides in politics. I cannot see that it would be at all more scandalous than that a man and his wife should take opposite sides in religion—going, for example, every Sunday to different places of worship, where each hears the creed of the other denounced as soul-destroying and damnable. It will serve to throw light upon the present problem if we consider for a moment how it happens that this latter spectacle is on the whole so rarely presented; and that, even where the event occurs, it is so frequently found consistent with tolerable harmony in married life.

The explanation, I have no doubt, is of this kind: where difference of religion consists with matrimonial happiness, it will generally be found that one or both of the partners do not take a very deep interest in the creeds they profess; while, on the other hand, where people do feel strongly on religion, they generally take care, in forming matrimonial alliances, to consort with those who, on fundamental points, are of the same opinion with themselves. Now it seems to me that this may serve to illustrate for us what will be the practical working of politics in respect to married life when women begin to receive a political education, or at least to learn as much about politics, and take as much or as little interest in them as men do. A number only too large of men and women will probably continue for long enough to take but small interest in public affairs, and these will marry, as they do now, with little reference to each other's political opinions; but the danger of discord from politics under such circumstances would be infinitesimal. The only cases in which this danger would become serious would be when both husband and wife were strong politicians. Here, no doubt, there would be danger; though no greater, I think, than when two persons of strong but opposite religious convictions enter into marriage. Mr. Smith seems to think that, because "religion is an affair of the other world," it is less likely than politics to be an occasion of strife. This is probable enough when people do not believe in another world; but when they do, and believe also that the fate of people there will depend on what they believe in this, I cannot see the wisdom of his remark. Some of the worst and cruellest wars that have ever been waged have been religious wars; and so notoriously is religion an engenderer of strife, that it is now scarcely good manners to moot a religious question in private society, where politics are quite freely and amicably discussed. If persons of genuine but different religious opinions can contrive to get on together in married life, they would certainly not be likely to be severed by political differences, however strongly their opinions might be held. But, however this

may be, my argument is that, in practice, such cases would very rarely occur. When politics became a subject of interest alike for men and for women, it would very soon become a principal consideration in determining matrimonial alliances. Even now this is the case to some extent, and it will no doubt become more and more so as the political education of women advances. Mr. Smith's question, therefore, "Would the harmony of most households bear the strain?" may be answered by saying that in very few households would there be any strain to bear; while in most—at least in those in which politics were intelligently cultivated—home life, no longer the vapid thing it is so often now, would acquire a new element of interest, and the family would be held together by powerful sympathies that now lie undeveloped.

Mr. Smith seems to think that, if women are only excluded from the suffrage, the harmony of married life can never be endangered by politics; but this is to attribute to the mere right of voting a degree of efficacy which I, for one, am not disposed to allow to it. If women only come to take an interest in politics—it matters not whether they have the suffrage or not—all the danger that can arise from the suffrage to married life will be already incurred. It is not the giving of a vote every four or five years that constitutes the danger, if danger there be; but the habitual mental attitude of husband and wife towards each other. Those, therefore, who share Mr. Smith's apprehensions on the present subject, ought clearly to take their stand against the suffrage movement very much higher up. They ought to oppose every extension of female education which may reasonably be expected to lead women to take an interest in politics. The intelligent study of history should, in the first place, be rigidly proscribed. Political economy would be excluded as a matter of course; and along with it, that large and increasing class of studies embraced under the name "social." Every one of these, intelligently cultivated, leads inevitably, where faculty is not wanting, to an interest in

contemporary politics; and if women are to be shut out from this field of ideas, lest perchance they should adopt opinions which should not be those of their future husbands, their education ought at once to be truncated by this large segment. Mr. Smith indeed suggests that women who are capable of discussing political questions "will find a sphere in the press." Does he then suppose that there would be less danger to the harmony of married life from women writing in the press—writing leaders, perhaps, for strong party papers—than from tendering a vote at the polls every four or five years? Besides, the suggestion falls utterly short of the requirements of the case. The number of women who are capable, or who desire, to find a sphere in the press are never likely to be more than a handful: the numbers who desire a liberal education, in the best and broadest sense of that word, and who are or may become quite fitted to form sound opinions on political questions, are already to be numbered by thousands, perhaps I might say by tens of thousands: what their numbers will become in another generation, I will not pretend to conjecture. Mr. Smith's suggestion, therefore, though graciously meant, is hardly to the purpose. Plainly nothing short of lopping off from the education of women some of the most important branches of human knowledge will meet the difficulty.

I must, before concluding, refer briefly (for my space is all but exhausted) to an aspect of the case touched on at the opening of these remarks—the probability of the admission of women to Parliament as a consequence of giving them the suffrage. As I have already pointed out, the latter concession by no means necessarily involves the former; so that it is quite open to those who are in favour of Woman Suffrage to decline, if they see fit to do so, to concede the latter privilege. For my own part, however, I desire to say frankly that I am in favour of removing, not only this, but all legal impediments whatever, to the freest choice by women of a career whether in political or in civil life. It is not that I look forward to women taking advantage, in any very large

degree, of the new fields of activity that would thus be opened to them; for I am not of Mr. Smith's opinion, that women can be "unsexed" by Acts of Parliament. I believe that all the substantial reasons of convenience, natural aptitude, and taste, which, in the division of labour between men and women, make it desirable that women should, as a rule, take charge of the domestic half of the world's work, and men of that which is transacted out of doors, will, whatever laws we may pass, remain in their full force, and will keep the general distribution of occupations between the sexes, even under the freest competition, in the main not very different from what it now is. Still, though this, as I believe, will be the rule, there will no doubt be numerous exceptions to it; and why should there not be? If some women find it suitable to their circumstances and to their natural talents or taste to embrace careers now open only to men, why should they be debarred from turning their abilities to the best account? If they make mistakes, as very possibly at first many will, and adopt unsuitable occupations, they will discover their mistakes as men do now, by experience, and their failures will serve as a warning to others. If, on the other hand, they prove successful in their ventures, their success can only be a gain for themselves and for society at large. All this would hold true, even though the alternative of marriage and domestic life were really open to every woman in the country. But it is a fact of very great importance as regards the practical aspect of this question that no inconsiderable number of women in this country pass, and cannot but pass, their lives unmarried. Mr. Smith, indeed, regards this as connected "with an abnormal and possibly transient state of things." For my part I regard it as a perfectly normal phenomenon in such a country as England, and, therefore, as likely to endure. In any case, while it lasts, the exclusion of women from professional and other careers is something more than a theoretical injustice. It is a real and substantial wrong, involving penury and all its consequences, inflicted on a large number of persons whose only crime is

their sex, and who only ask to be permitted to earn a livelihood by making themselves useful to their fellow creatures. The claim to be admitted to Parliament, indeed, if it should be advanced (which it has not yet been), would stand on somewhat different ground. Exclusion in this case would not mean exclusion from the means of earning a livelihood, and therefore the reasons in favour of the claim are undoubtedly less strong than those which may be urged in favour of opening professional and industrial careers; but why should women not be allowed the fullest and freest use of their faculties in any walk of life, whether lucrative or otherwise, in which any competent portion of the community may think it expedient to employ them? At all events the onus of proof lies with those who would resist such a claim; and if opponents have nothing better to urge than the fatuous jokes which have hitherto been the staple of their argument, but from which Mr. Smith has had the good taste to abstain, the case against women is certainly not a strong one. Whether many women, if the opportunity offered, would be ambitious of a parliamentary career; or whether, in this case, they would find many constituencies disposed to elect them, are questions, the consideration of which may perhaps be left, without disadvantage, to a future day.

THE END.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE,

THE COUNTERFEIT & THE TRUE.

REASONS FOR OPPOSING BOTH.

BY

REAR-ADMIRAL MAXSE.

LONDON:

W. RIDGWAY, 169, PICCADILLY, W.

Price One Shilling.