

# WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

VOL. VI.—No. 67. PUBLISHED MONTHLY.  
REGISTERED FOR TRANSMISSION ABROAD.

SEPTEMBER 1, 1875.

PRICE ONE PENNY.  
BY POST THREE HALFPENCE.

THE Session which has just closed has not been marked by any great advance in legislation, political or social, but it has not been without results of a progressive character with respect to questions affecting women.

The House of Commons has devoted two afternoons during the Session to regular debates on bills for extending the civil and personal rights of women. The first took place on March 3rd, on Mr. COWPER-TEMPLE'S Bill, "to remove doubts as to the powers of the Scotch Universities to admit women as students, and to grant degrees to women," and which proposed to enact that "the admission of women as students, and the providing instruction for women, and the granting of degrees to women, should be deemed to be within the Act to make provision for the better government of the Universities of Scotland."

Mr. COWPER-TEMPLE, in introducing the Bill, said that, seeing the advantages which had resulted from local examinations in connection with our great Universities, and how beneficial had been the results of professional lectures in giving an impetus to the spread of knowledge among the artisan class, few, he thought, would dispute the extension of the sphere of University usefulness, which he invited the House to sanction. If the Bill passed, a great bar would be removed from the way of women who were anxious to earn their own livelihood by the exercise of the noble profession of healing, for which they were peculiarly fitted, and it would be a fair and just concession to the large number of women who desired to have competent medical practitioners of their own sex to go to for treatment or advice. Mr. MAITLAND, who opposed the Bill, appeared to do so mainly on the ground that it would not effect the object aimed at by its promoters. Mr. FORSYTH said that in most European countries, notably in Italy, France, Switzerland, Saxony, Sweden, and Russia, women were admitted to the medical profession, and many of them had attained to great eminence. What reason could be urged why women should not be allowed to practice medicine? If women of education could earn a livelihood in an honourable and useful career it was a cruel injustice that that career should not be open to them.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE said his right hon. friend knew

that in supporting this case of young ladies in Edinburgh he was really speaking for a great many other women, young, old, and middle aged, all over the United Kingdom; whereupon the House of Commons laughed. But our readers will probably be as unable to see the joke involved in this proposition as to discover therein any objection to Mr. COWPER-TEMPLE'S Bill. The member for Cambridge University went on to ask what it was but "misguided ambition that prevented these women from desiring to do good to their fellow-creatures in a way of which FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE and MARY STANLEY had given them glorious examples. Why should not the faculty of nursing be developed in colleges for nurses. The attempt to make woman the antagonist of man in the battle of life was based on a fallacy that ignored the eternal difference between men and women. Were the promoters of this Bill prepared to say that women should be allowed to plead in courts of law, to draw conveyances, and what not? If they were not prepared to say so, their whole argument broke down." Mr. STEWART denied that there was any necessity for the measure, and asked hon. members "whether they ever met with women who in serious illness would have recourse to a woman doctor. In such cases patients would trust rather to the sterner and harder nature of the nobler sex."

Dr. PLAYFAIR said the Bill did not merely purport to admit women to the medical profession; its object was to admit women to graduate in every faculty—Art, Medicine, Law, and Divinity. He would not now discuss the question of women's education. It was too large a question to treat upon such a Bill, and ought to be discussed, if at all, after due inquiry, it might be by a Royal Commission, and with reference not to the Scotch Universities only, but all the Universities in the kingdom. The Bill would override all the habits and traditions of the Scotch Universities; it would not supply the means which were necessary to carry out its object, or the safeguard which ought to be at the same time provided. He should oppose the second reading.

Mr. STANSFELD said there had been a chorus of profession of violent friendship towards women among hon.

members who were combining to defeat this Bill. The fact was that a good deal of Trade Unionism was to be discovered outside the Trade Unions of working men in this country. He knew of no profession in which such a feeling was more rife than in the medical profession, especially where medical men were congregated in the Universities. The hon. member (Mr. BERESFORD HOPE) who had professed the utmost loyalty and devotion to the sex, and seemed to have taken them under his special charge, made a suggestion which it was not very easy to follow or understand—that women were destined to act as nurses in sickness, but were unable to apply their intelligence to the study of medicine, which was beyond their sphere. In support of his views the hon. member mentioned FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE; but to say that she was “an admirable nurse” was a most insufficient and inaccurate description of this lady, whose work was really that of a great reformer and administrator.

Mr. ROEBUCK said he was not one of those who passed as the friend of what were called “strong-minded women.” He spoke as a man of the world, asking himself whether what this Bill proposed to do would be mischievous to the community or not. In the present state of the world, there was a great competition among us all for the means of life, and it had been asked by many who had directed their attention to such subjects whether some better means of providing subsistence for women could not be provided. It had been thought that women might direct their attention to medical science so as to apply those faculties which God had given them for the benefit of their fellow-creatures. Under these circumstances certain ladies had endeavoured to learn the Science and Art of Medicine, and had devoted themselves to the study with great intelligence and industry. Was there anything very wrong in what those women had done? Then a Bill was brought in to enable the Scotch Universities to do that which those ladies thought they had the power to do when they went to Scotland—namely, to grant them degrees. That was all which the Bill did; no more and no less. People might hide it as they liked, they might cover it in fine phrases, but at the bottom this was a Trades' Union question. Money was at the bottom of it. It was feared by the medical profession that if this Bill passed they would have more competition, and that women would be their competitors. He asked the House to consider the question in that light. They might talk for a month, they might quote names great in history, in art, and in science, but they could not rub off the stain that would be thrown upon

the House if it refused to do this justice to women, and allow them to use those faculties which God had given them in an honest manner to gain their own livelihood.

The LORD ADVOCATE said that so far from the opposition to this Bill being founded on the Trades' Union spirit, as stated by the hon. and learned member, the movement in favour of the medical education of women in the University of Edinburgh had its origin in the Medical Faculty. The Medical Faculty engaged to give their services in private lectures in order to enable the ladies to obtain a medical education, and continued to do so as long as it was in their power. All the judges, without exception, were of opinion that there was no power in the University Court, or any other body, to give the right of graduation to ladies. Why should this Bill be made permissive and not compulsory? And why should it be confined to Scotland? Why should it not be made applicable to the University of London and to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge? The Universities of Scotland had done a great deal for education, and he begged the House not to introduce an element of discontent and confusion into them by passing this Bill.

Mr. COWPER-TEMPLE having replied, the House divided, when there appeared for the Bill 151, against 194; majority against the Bill, 43.

Another Bill, introduced by Mr. COWPER-TEMPLE, proposed to amend the Medical Act so as to permit the registration of women who had obtained foreign medical degrees, but this never came to a second reading, and was withdrawn on July 28th.

On July 30th, Mr. COWPER-TEMPLE asked whether Her MAJESTY'S Government contemplated the introduction of any measure on the subject in the next Session of Parliament. Lord SANDON replied that during the recess the Government would give the matter their consideration and would be prepared next Session to state whether they thought legislation desirable or not. Mr. RUSSELL GURNEY said that after the declaration of opinion from the Medical Council, one could hardly conceive that things could remain in their present state.

The second debate on the rights of the unrepresented half of the people was that on the cardinal question of giving them representation. Mr. FORSYTH moved the second reading of the Women's Disabilities Removal Bill on April 7th, and was supported by Mr. STANSFELD, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. O'SULLIVAN. The Bill was opposed by Mr. CHAPLIN, Mr. LEATHAM, Mr. SMOLLETT, Mr. BERESFORD HOPE, Mr. NEWDEGATE, and Sir HENRY JAMES, and

the numbers on the division were, for the Bill 152, against 187; majority against, 35. The debate has been fully reported and commented on in the columns of this *Journal*; it is therefore needless to do more than call attention to the remarkable closeness of the numbers who voted with Mr. COWPER-TEMPLE and with Mr. FORSYTH, namely, 151 and 152. This is the more curious as the composition of the respective minorities was widely different. Many of the principal opponents of women suffrage voted for Mr. COWPER-TEMPLE'S Bill, which was also supported by nearly the whole of the ex-Ministry, while it was opposed by the Government. On the other hand, many opponents of Mr. COWPER-TEMPLE'S Bill voted with Mr. FORSYTH, including the PRIME MINISTER, the CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, and other leading members of the Cabinet.

The only measure passed this year for the amendment of any portion of that law which Mr. GLADSTONE says “does less than justice to women” received the Royal assent on the very last day of the Session. This was Mr. CHARLEY'S Offences against the Person Bill. It extended to women between the ages of twelve and thirteen some protection against outrage. When the Bill reached the Lords the age was reduced to twelve, on the ground that as a woman could be married at twelve it was not right to protect her beyond that age. When the Bill thus “amended” was returned to the Commons, it remained for weeks on the order book, postponed from day to day. On July 31st, at half-past seven, when this order was called, the House was instantly counted out. The next time it was on the paper was Tuesday, August 2nd, and Mr. W. H. SMITH moved the adjournment of the House over that day, as, he said, there was “no business” on the paper. At last Mr. CHARLEY made a strong appeal to the Government, and the HOME SECRETARY interposed in time to allow of the Lords' amendments to be considered. The Commons “disagreed” with this amendment, and reported their reasons to the Lords after the legislative business of the Session was over. But the Lords, being a non-representative House, had some consideration for the business of the unrepresented half of the people. They held a special sitting to receive the report, and they concluded not to insist on their amendment. Women of thirteen years of age have therefore received some slight additional legal provision for their personal security.

Not so women of maturer age. On these the clog and the fist may work their savage will, while the HOME SECRETARY complacently deprecates “panic legislation.” The *Saturday Review*, in commenting with some indigna-

tion on the conduct of the Government with respect to this subject, remarked that if Mr. CROSS had withdrawn his Bill because it was a bad Bill that would have been a sufficient reason; but that as it had been prepared after carefully collecting a mass of opinions from magistrates and municipalities, there was no excuse for the plea that it had been framed in a panic. Just before the recess Colonel EGERTON LEIGH asked the FIRST LORD of the TREASURY whether a Bill for the better protection of women and children from gross and violent assaults and ill-treatment would be introduced as one of the earliest measures of next season, and Mr. DISRAELI replied that it was inconvenient to give a pledge on the subject. One is tempted to ask whether the accidental proximity to his own person of the clog of one of his constituents might not awaken the HOME SECRETARY to a sense of the inconveniences incidental to the free play of such appendages; but these gentry know well enough where they may strike with impunity, and as they have votes to protect themselves in the free exercise of their clogs, they can give an effectual reminder to the Government that it might be inconvenient to interfere with them. Colonel EGERTON LEIGH would plead with infinitely greater force for some better protection for women from violent assaults if his clients had a few votes to give, and the suffrage would be a more efficient safeguard than the lash for the protection of women from violence and wrong.

The Mutiny Act and the Marine Mutiny Act, passed every year, contain clauses which either specially exempt soldiers and sailors from the legal obligations in cases of wrong towards women which would be incurred by other men, or surround the enforcement of these claims with conditions that render them practically inoperative.

The Contagious Diseases Act places all women in certain towns and districts under police surveillance, and deprives them of the safeguards secured by the ordinary criminal law to accused persons in all other parts of the country. The repeal of this Act was proposed by Sir HARCOURT JOHNSTONE on June 23rd, and rejected by 126 votes to 308.

The Infanticide Bill, introduced by Mr. CHARLEY, was withdrawn before the third reading. It reduced the crime of killing an infant below the rank of murder, and permitted a conviction as for a minor offence. The real object of this Bill was to add a fresh fang to enable the law to clutch miserable and deserted mothers, whose infants might be destroyed in the agonies of their desperate condition, or in the temporary insanity which is one

of the perils of maternity, and who now, through the unwillingness of juries to send them to the gallows, frequently escape with as little legal responsibility as that incurred by fathers who leave their offspring to perish. The Bill is to be re-introduced next Session.

The Deceased Wife's Sister's Marriage Bill, after having passed the House of Commons and been rejected by the Lords, Session after Session of the late Parliament, was submitted for the first time to the verdict of the new Parliament on February 17th, and rejected by a majority of 171 to 142. It would have altered the law prohibiting marriages of affinity in such a manner as to place a husband in a different position to his wife's relations from that of the wife towards the relatives of her husband.

The foregoing summary of the proceedings of the House of Commons on questions specially affecting women proves the fallacy of the old assertion that women have nothing to do with politics, and furnishes the strongest argument in support of the claim of women to be allowed a voice in determining such questions.

"BEAUTY provoketh thieves as well as gold," was an axiom quoted in the House of Commons during the debate on Mr. FORSYTH'S Bill, and, by a remarkable feat of masculine logic, construed to support the theory that the thieves ought to be left in the undisturbed monopoly of the privilege of making the laws. We have had an example of the influence of this monopoly in the tenderness with which the law has dealt with the person of an offender convicted of a dastardly outrage of this nature, whereby the life of the victim was placed in deadly peril; and in the all but universal assumption that the offence was the result of a sudden impulse in an otherwise honourable career. It seems more probable that the offence was the outcome of a systematic disregard of the personal rights of women, induced by a tone of thought too prevalent among men, especially military men, which causes them to look upon any attractive girl who may happen to be for the moment unprotected, as lawful prey. If she is permanently unprotected and poor, she may be injured with comparative or absolute impunity; and in a recent painful case it is probable that the indignation of "society" was aroused, not so much by the offence against the young lady herself, as by the offence against her brothers' sister, and the consideration of her social position. We have little or no faith in the efficacy of increased severity of punishment to check offences against women, and it is not in this direction that we look for a remedy;

but we have the most profound confidence in the influence of laws which should raise their political and personal *status* to a level with that of men. So long as women are held to be merely a superior kind of domestic animal without political rights, so long will their personal rights be held in a somewhat similar category. During the arguments in the Court of Common Pleas on the claim of women ratepayers to be put on the Parliamentary register under the Act of 1867, one of the Judges likened the political condition of a woman to that of a horse or a dog. After this, we need not be much surprised if women should occasionally receive from the uneducated roughs who are their political superiors, the treatment these give to their horses and dogs, nor if the personal rights of women who are unattached to some man who might be aggrieved by a wrong done to them, should receive small consideration at the hands of those who are bred up in the faith that the final cause of the existence of women is to make life pleasant to men.

MR. MUNDELLA, in a speech at Sheffield, commenting on a recent public act of HER MAJESTY, said he thanked God we had such a virtuous and sensible woman to reign over us. The sentiment expressed by the hon. member for Sheffield will find general concurrence, and we would suggest to all who recognise the beneficent character of such influence on the politics of this realm, the consideration that the QUEEN is not the only virtuous and sensible woman in her dominions, and the question whether such influence would not be extended and strengthened by the admission of the women of the people, as well as of the women of the royal family, to share the political rights and duties appertaining to the class to which they belong.

MARCUS AURELIUS, as all the world knows, begins his meditations by a litany of thanksgiving for the good people—parents, teachers, wife, and friends—who had taught him each some valuable lesson. In the same excellent spirit, we women can do no less than commence our monthly retrospect by an expression of tender gratitude to Messrs. BOUVERIE, HUGESSEN, SHUTTLEWORTH, &c., for the great help and encouragement they have been so kind as to afford us by the formation of their Association for the Preservation of the Purity of the British Constitution by the exclusion of Women from the Suffrage. None of our friends could have aided us so well to overcome our constitutional mistrust in ourselves and our

cause. Staunch and valiant champions like Mr. JACOB BRIGHT, Mr. FORSYTH, and Mr. STANSFELD, went on year after year at our annual meetings telling us that we needs must win at last, since justice and right were on our side; and proclaiming to an inattentive House of Commons the growing volume of the movement as demonstrated by our enormous petitions. We thanked them heartily for their *bonnæ volunté* and their encouraging prophecies; but we could not wholly suppress the apprehension that with them "the wish was father to the thought," and that their confidence that a just cause must necessarily, sooner or later, prove a successful one might be found a somewhat too optimistic view of matters in a world wherein the particular wrong to be redressed has already had several thousand years lease of existence.

But now that it has come to pass that our opponents obviously think us so near the winning post that they must hasten to place a barricade in our way, we naturally take courage, and shall henceforth feel well assured that it is no unattainable and illusory dream of political equality which we have pursued, but a very practical and tangible aim, which our labours, perseverance, and resolution will tolerably certainly secure. Of course this conviction in our peculiar position is inestimably valuable. "To be weak is to be miserable," and to be too well aware of our own weakness, and trained to exaggerate it tenfold, has been the bane of our sex; prolonging and extending the misery through every detail of existence, sanitary and intellectual, social and political. As "nothing succeeds like success," so nothing fails so surely as the undertakings of people who anticipate failure. Henceforth it will be quite impossible for the most modest among us to treat the cause of Women's Suffrage as a vain thing, fondly imagined, never having a chance of realisation. It must have a very good chance, or Sir HENRY JAMES, Mr. BOUVERIE, Mr. BERESFORD, and all those sagacious senators would never have taken the trouble to form their association. Nay, more; as the ordinary rules and methods of Parliamentary warfare have seemed to them insufficient to be relied on in such an emergency for the purpose of quashing us, and they have found it prudent to form an unprecedented Solemn League and Covenant between M.P.'s and ex-M.P.'s on both sides of the House, we are driven blushing to the conclusion that we must even stand on stronger ground than the male householders and lodgers, who were last admitted within the pale of the Constitution, and against whom no vindicators of its "purity"

(save the mark!) thought it necessary to band themselves in any such holy alliance.

We are of course the more grateful to these generous foes, inasmuch as they have done us this valuable service undoubtedly at a considerable personal sacrifice. The position in which they have placed themselves is so eminently ridiculous, that it is inconceivable that some among them—at all events those who have been diligently sharpening their wit upon us annually, as on a whetstone, on each second reading of our Bill—should not perceive the delicious absurdity involved therein. They have been telling us, and the universe at large, that we are too weak, too unpractical, too insignificant, too few, to aspire to the high honour of voting for representatives in Parliament—even such representatives as themselves. And lo! they confess, by action louder than words, that they are convinced we are strong enough, sensible enough, and numerous and powerful enough to make good our demands, unless they stand shoulder to shoulder against us like the three hundred heroes at Thermopylæ! Then, again, there are certain traditions of sentiment about women which it must be rather hard for an English gentleman, who has not been brought up in a harem or a wigwam, wholly to shake off. There is a pretty general impression that mothers, and wives, and sisters are not natural enemies, but rather persons to be cherished and respected, and whose wishes are worthy of fair consideration. When we reflect on all which a man—every man now living on earth—owes to some woman or to many women, to the mother who bore him in her agony and fed from her breast, the nurse who guarded his helpless infancy, the sister who was the truest, tenderest friend of his boyhood, the wife who filled his cup in manhood with joy, the daughter whom he hopes will smooth for him the pillow of old age—when we think of all this, and then see a dozen men setting themselves deliberately to oppose the efforts of our sex to obtain the obvious mode of redress for our many wrongs, the sense of justice and honour, not to speak of gratitude or chivalry, is rudely shocked. We feel that for a man to take such a step with a free conscience he should have some ground beyond a sentimental dislike to strong-mindedness, or a petty spite against the whole sex, perchance, because one member of it has preferred some other man to himself. He ought to have been (let us say) some unhappy foundling, whose miserable mother left him at the workhouse door,—who never had a sister or a woman friend—whose wife has betrayed him—whose daughter has eloped with his groom. No normal,

honourable, happy life of an English gentleman explains the sentiment of misogyny, and those who practically *affiche* it by organising themselves into a society to oppose the cause of women, inevitably suggest to beholders the question, "What can their relations with women have been, to inspire them with such misplaced zeal?" *Sur quelle herbe ont ils marchés?*

It cannot be pleasant, and it will not, we think, be particularly useful to these valiant champions of the stronger sex, to have created this modern order of knight-errantry, sworn *not* to "protect woman," or even to allow them to obtain the protection of equal laws. Unless we are mistaken, the majority of members of both Houses of Parliament will observe of the Arthur of this Round Table that, as Social Failures are turning their attention to politics—a Political Failure had better direct his mind to making himself delightful in his wife's drawing-room, instead of hanging about the purlieus of the House of Commons to cabal with his quondam fellow-members in a manner not usually recognised by Parliamentary etiquette. And for the other members of the society, it will also be thought that it would be more graceful for them to return, one to his stable, another to his fairy tales, and a third to the exercise of his "Bataavian wit" on the abstruse problems offered by the introduction into churches of reredoses and baldachinos, rather than bestir themselves thus unitedly to mop out the tide which, after all, will very certainly, sooner or later, reach high-water mark. F. P. C.

#### PETITIONS TO THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

The Select Committee on Public Petitions has issued its 31st report, which has reference to the period between the 22nd July and the 4th August, and the particulars of the petitions presented during that time extend over twenty pages of the document. In the summary at the end of the report, which gives the total numbers of petitions presented on different subjects and of the signatures to them since the commencement of the session, it is stated that 48,797 persons have signed petitions in favour of the Household Counties Franchise Bill, 36,878 in favour of an alteration of the laws relating to the representation of the people, and 415,622 in favour of the Women's Disabilities Removal Bill. The Intoxicating Liquor (Sundays) Bill has been supported by 154,760 persons, and the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Bill by 220,736 persons, though the latter has been opposed in petition by 77,025 persons. Over 182,000 persons have petitioned in favour of the Monastic and Conventual Institutions Bill, 208,363 signatures appeared in favour of the Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, the latter measure having been, however, opposed by 11,185 persons. The Contagious Diseases Acts Repeal Bill found favour with 209,245 persons. Twenty-one petitions, signed by 44,639 persons, have been presented in favour of the abolition of Gray's-inn; 280,318 persons desire an inquiry into the trial of the Tichborne claimant; and two petitions, signed by 2,996 persons, pray for both inquiry into the case and the abolition of the Inn; 36,877 persons pray the House for Universal Male Suffrage, and 983,488 for the Permissive Prohibitory Liquor Bill.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INTELLIGENCE.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, July 30.

##### MEDICAL EDUCATION OF WOMEN.

Mr. COWPER-TEMPLE rose to call attention to the letter from the Lord President of the Council, requesting the opinion of the Medical Council on the subject of the exclusion of women from registration as practitioners of medicine; and to ask whether Her Majesty's Government contemplate the introduction of any measure on the subject in the next session of Parliament?

Viscount SANDON said the remarks of the member for Hampshire were well worthy of consideration on account of the prominent part his right hon. friend took some years ago in the legislation which led to the establishment of the General Medical Council. He agreed with his right hon. friend that it would be undesirable to raise on the present occasion a general discussion respecting the admission of women into the medical profession. For the first time since the present Government came into office this subject was brought under the notice of the House at the beginning of the session. They felt it desirable, before forming any opinion upon it, to refer it to the consideration of the General Medical Council, which was one of the most distinguished bodies in the United Kingdom, being composed of eminent medical men in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and also representing the universities. When, therefore, the right hon. gentlemen the members for Hampshire and Halifax brought the subject forward, Her Majesty's Government thought it would be better to get the impartial opinion of the General Medical Council with regard to it. That body, however, assembled only once a year, but the matter was referred to it at the annual meeting in the month of June. They went into it with great care. Some of the most distinguished members of the council took part in the debates, which lasted two or three days, and after a full and careful consideration of the question they addressed a letter to the Lord President of the Council. At this late period of the session they did not feel themselves to be in a position to consider this important subject, but they would give it their best attention, and next session they would be prepared to state whether, in their judgment, legislation was desirable or not. The Government felt the country had a right to know next session what course they intended to pursue, and whether they would move in the matter themselves or leave the subject to be dealt with by an independent member.

Mr. R. GURNLEY was glad to find that after long and anxious consideration the Medical Council had expressed their decided opinion that women should no longer be excluded from the profession, and one could hardly conceive that after such a declaration of opinion from them things could remain in their present state.

Lord SANDON, in answer to Mr. Playfair, said he had no objection to lay papers upon the subject on the table.

August 2.

##### ASSAULTS ON WOMEN AND CHILDREN.

Colonel E. LEIGH asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether a Bill for the better protection of women and children from gross and violent assaults and ill-treatment would be introduced as one of the earliest measures of the next Session.

Mr. DISRAELI.—The subject on which my right hon. friend takes so much interest, and which is, I am sure, shared by a great majority of the House, has not been lost sight of by the Government, but I hope he will see that it is inconvenient as a general principle to pledge the Government to the introduction of measures in another Session. (Hear, hear.)

#### PUBLIC MEETINGS.

##### SALTBURN-BY-THE-SEA.

Addresses on behalf of the Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage were delivered in the Ruby Street Hall, Saltburn-by-the-Sea, on Monday, August 9th, 1875, by Miss Becker, of Manchester, and Mrs. Oliver Scatcherd, honorary secretary of the Yorkshire National Society for Women's Suffrage. The Rev. B. Irvin, Vicar of Saltburn, occupied the chair. The addresses were received with manifest interest, and the usual votes of thanks concluded the proceedings.

##### REDCAR.

On Tuesday, August 10th, Miss Becker and Mrs. Oliver Scatcherd addressed a meeting in the Central Hall, Redcar. The chair was occupied by James Bowron, junr., Esq., who expressed his sympathy with the object of the society. After the addresses of the ladies, votes of thanks were proposed and carried, and the meeting separated.

##### HARROGATE.

On the afternoon of Thursday, August 12th, Miss Becker delivered an address at a meeting in the Spa Concert Room, Harrogate. Mrs. Oliver Scatcherd occupied the chair, and in the course of an excellent address she drew attention to the able manner in which the women weavers of Dewsbury had conducted the recent movement for an advance of wages, and to the evidence given before the Royal Commission as to the injurious effects of the legislative restrictions of women's labour. The audience, which contained a very large proportion of ladies, listened to the addresses with marked attention. At the close a gentleman in the body of the room rose to move a vote of thanks, and said that his sister had been turned out of a farm which she had occupied for twenty years, because the landlord wanted a tenant who could vote, and he gave an instance which had come under his jurisdiction as a Warwickshire magistrate of the hardship of the law with regard to the maintenance of wives. The votes were carried unanimously, and the assemblage dispersed.

##### COLNE.

On August 16th, a crowded meeting was held in the Iron School, Colne, Lancashire, by the kind permission of the owner, R. Wildman, Esq., who occupied the chair.

The CHAIRMAN, on rising, said they were met to consider the case of the ladies—the weaker sex—he did not mean intellectually, but physically; and it would be for them, after hearing the lecture, to take the matter into consideration, and, if they could digest it, then to turn it into their political life. He found, on referring to certain literature which he had seen that evening, that the cause was backed by such men as Disraeli, Gladstone, and Stafford Northcote.

Miss BECKER, in the course of her lecture, said women's suffrage was sometimes improperly understood. Some persons seemed to think it meant that all women should be able to vote, but it was not so. It simply asked that the same franchise should be extended to women as was allowed to men. The Reform Act of 1867 was said to be framed to give the franchise to every householder in a borough who was rated to the poor. But the fact was that one-seventh of the ratepayers in boroughs were distinctly excluded from exercising the franchise. When Mr. Disraeli was at Manchester, a gentleman who chanced to be riding with him pointed him to a row of twenty houses, saying, "See, your Reform Bill has given the franchise to sixteen householders in that row, but to four it has not, four of the householders being women." To which Mr. Disraeli replied that it was an oversight in the Bill, and he would remember it at the first opportunity. She considered it was

unjust that women, who were householders and paid taxes, should have no voice in sending men to Parliament to make laws which compelled them to pay taxes. In one of the London Revision Courts, there were two persons' names on the list claiming to be put on the register. One was that of a lady who was sister to one of the Cabinet Ministers; her claim was rejected. The other was that of a man then serving a term of two years' imprisonment in Millbank prison; his claim was allowed. Thus a man might rob his mistress and be sent to prison, and when he came out he could vote to send a man to Parliament who helped to make laws to govern the interests of his own mistress. It was computed that there were about 22,000 women farmers in this country, but these the law had suddenly turned out. The landlord went round and said the law did not allow him to have a person as farmer who could not vote, and the consequence was that she was turned away, which was not unfrequently at a very great loss to herself and family. Some people would say there was a great difference between men and women. She agreed there was great difference in many respects, but the difference did not extend to national laws; the same principles of political justice would apply to both sexes. Mr. Gladstone once said, "The law of England did much less justice to women than men," yet that gentleman remained three years Prime Minister without taking any steps to redress that injustice under which women laboured. The true explanation was that women had no voice in sending that gentleman's followers to Parliament, so he had no power in his hands to redress the injustice. In the Session of 1873, a bill was brought in which was designed to amend the state of things in regard to women, and during the Session it was six times counted out, so that, out of the 650 members sent to Parliament, presumably not 40 could be found who would give consideration to a serious question which affected so large a proportion of Her Majesty's subjects. Women having had no voice in returning the men to Parliament, could well afford to treat the subject as they did. It was alleged by some that women should have nothing to do with politics. She maintained that women were quite as much interested in the well-being of the nation as men were. Others asserted that women were not sufficiently educated as to be able to properly exercise the power to vote. If that were so, it was the fault of the men in not providing the same chances for the education of girls as boys, it was wrong for men to allege a deficiency which was owing entirely to themselves. The lecturer held that in school board elections women exercised their right to vote as intelligently as the majority of the opposite sex, and ought to be consulted on political questions. One question which had been before the House of Commons, and would no doubt be again, the "Marriage with Deceased Wife's Sister Bill," just as much affected women as men, and ought not they to have their feelings consulted on the subject? Another question, such as the disestablishment of the English Church, might some time be brought up, and she contended the church was as much the church of the women as the men, and she thought that they ought to be consulted in the matter.—A resolution in favour of the Bill for removal of the electoral disabilities of women was put to the meeting, and a large number of hands were held up in its favour. The Chairman declared the resolution to be carried unanimously, and stated that petitions would, during the week, be handed round for signatures, which would afterwards be forwarded to J. M. Holt, Esq., M.P., it being understood that both he and Mr. Sturges, M.P., were favourable to the Bill. A hearty vote of thanks was accorded to Miss Becker, and a similar compliment to the Chairman having been paid, the meeting broke up.

## AN EDUCATIONAL TEST.

The relative density of the educational ignorance prevailing in different parts of England, is well gauged in a recently published Parliamentary return, giving the percentages of men and women who signed the marriage register with marks from 1866 to 1872. Taking the several divisions of England, the Metropolitan—including parts of Middlesex, Surrey, and Kent—figures with percentages of 9.1 men and 14.5 women unable to write, being the lowest in the entire list. Next comes the South-Eastern, comprising parts of Surrey and Kent, and all Sussex, Hampshire, and Berkshire. Here the percentages are 17 for men and 14.5 for women, being one of the instances where the latter show more learning than the former. In the South Midland, containing part of Middlesex and all Hertfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire, Northamptonshire, Huntingdonshire, Bedfordshire, and Cambridgeshire, the percentage for men is 24.5 and for women 23.5, showing a very near equality of educational attainments between the sexes. But in the Eastern Division, including Essex, Suffolk, and Norfolk, the female portion of the community appear to comparative advantage, their figure being 22.6 against 28.8 for the men. In Wilts, Dorset, Devon, Cornwall, and Somerset, which together make up the South-Western Division, 21.1 per cent of men and 23.4 of women could not write their names; while in the West Midland, comprising Gloucestershire, Herefordshire, Shropshire, Staffordshire, Worcestershire, and Warwickshire, the masculine percentage is 26.9 and the feminine 31.9. Less educational deficiency displays itself in the North Midland division, the figures for Leicestershire, Rutland, Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire, and Derbyshire, jointly being 20.6 for men and 25.4 for women. Cheshire and Lancashire—the North-Western division—show a remarkable difference between the attainments of the two sexes, the percentage for men being only 21.4 against 39.9 for women. Much the same disparity is to be seen in the case of Yorkshire—a division to itself—where the respective figures are 19.3 and 33.5; while the Northern division, comprising Durham, Northumberland, Cumberland, and Westmorland, follows suit with a percentage of 19.3 for males and 30.4 for females. In Wales, however, both sexes display an exceptional lack of education, no less than 31.2 per cent of the men and 44.8 of the women being unable to sign their marriage registers. As the mean average for all England is given at 20.2 per cent of males and 27.8 for females, it would seem that feminine education is more neglected than masculine. This is especially noticeable in the Northern counties, Lancashire appearing with a percentage of 41.0 uneducated women against 21.5 men, or nearly double the former; while in Northumberland the figures are respectively 24.6 and 14.4, and in Cumberland 27.7 and 16.8. Passing from the table giving these general details to the one dealing separately with districts containing Parliamentary boroughs, the percentages are 18.9 for men and 28.4 for women, being slightly below the average of all England in both cases. On the other hand, districts not containing such boroughs show greater density of educational ignorance among the men and less among the women than the general average, the figures being 24.0 and 26.0 respectively. Hence, while the male inhabitants of districts containing Parliamentary boroughs are better educated than their class in other districts, exactly the reverse is the case in regard to women. This being established beyond dispute, two interesting questions arise. In the first place, we have to account for the fact that, in districts where the number of men possessing votes is comparatively large, their average educational attainments are greater than in divisions where the suffrage remains restricted. Secondly, why should women living in districts containing Parliamentary

boroughs show so much more want of education than the men? When they reside in parts not possessing such boroughs, there is very little educational disparity between the sexes, the figure for males being 24 and for women 26, or a difference of 2 per cent. But under the influence of town associations, the percentage for men falls to 18.9, while that for women rises to 28.4, being a difference of 9.5 per cent. It would of course be rash to generalise from this fact that the increased educational attainments of men in such districts are entirely due to the wider distribution of the suffrage. Other causes may be at work to produce the result, especially the necessity that even the lowest class of workmen find in towns of acquiring the elements of education. Yet, after allowance has been made for the operation of such causes, there appear some grounds for inferring that the exercise of the franchise is in itself an educational influence, stimulating those possessing it to acquire the rudiments of learning. Except by giving a certain amount of weight to this theory, it seems difficult to account for the somewhat anomalous facts brought into light in this return. But if it be granted that the gift of the suffrage tends to stimulate the acquisition of education by the working classes, then it becomes easy to see why men in borough districts should show more signs of learning than their brethren in the purely country parts, while women in both cases remain on much the same educational footing. As the question of granting the suffrage to female householders is certain to be heard again next session, we would commend the return in question to the promoters of the movement. Perhaps searching inquiry might establish the fact that the right to vote does stimulate those who exercise it to the acquisition of learning. At present it is only possible to suggest that the above-quoted statistics dimly point to some such inference. Were it proved, those who are fighting the battle of the weaker sex would find a very serviceable weapon ready for their hands, since the most determined opponent of women's rights could not argue against their claims to an equality of education.—*Examiner*.

## WIVES' RIGHTS TO SEPARATE PROPERTY.

The case to which we yesterday drew attention as having been decided in the Lancashire Court of Chancery on Saturday last, presents features of importance that seem to deserve comment. Although several side issues were involved, the main question before the court was whether a wife could claim certain property given to her by her husband for her own separate use against him and his representatives. According to the evidence, the articles claimed were either wedding or birthday presents, and included such substantial gifts as a landau, and a pair of horses with their harness. Other presents, such as pictures, ornaments, lace, tea and dinner services, had previously been surrendered to the plaintiff, but it was contended for the defence that the carriage and horses were not absolute gifts, but provided for the temporary accommodation of the lady. With a view to establishing this point the defendant's counsel stated that the husband had frequently ridden in the landau, while the wife sometimes used his brougham. This ingenious plea had, however, little effect, the Vice-Chancellor deciding that the lady was fully entitled to the articles claimed as her private property. He, therefore, gave a decree in that sense, directing the defendant to pay the value of the carriage and horses to the plaintiff, in default of being able to hand over the property itself. As no notice was given of an intention to appeal against this decision, it may be assumed to represent a correct view of the law in cases where proprietary rights of husbands and wives come into conflict. If married ladies are entitled to claim such articles as carriages

and horses for their private property, because they were birthday or wedding gifts, it is difficult to see any limit to similar claims. If a landau and pair may be thus privileged against seizure, why not a drag and four, or a tame hippopotamus, or anything else given to a wife "for her separate and unconditional use?" Yet, although the law thus laid down at Liverpool might be capable of abuse in unscrupulous hands, there can be no doubt about the equity of granting to married women a full measure of protection in regard to what can be proved their personal property. When wedding presents are bestowed on a bride-expectant, it is not with a view to providing for the future necessities of the bridegroom; nor when a husband gives his wife a bracelet or brooch ought the article to be regarded as a merely temporary loan, to be restored whenever the giver's finances run dry.—*Globe, Aug. 17th*.

## A HARD CASE.

A few years ago, Miss M. A. P. married her cousin H. R. At the time of her marriage M. A. P. had £350, which sum, not being brought under settlement, became the property of her husband. In 1872, on the death of an uncle, she became entitled under his will to £518, which also became her husband's property. In 1873 Mr. H. R. bought a house and shop for £1,200. In 1875 he died intestate, and the house and shop have become the property of her husband's heir-at-law, his brother's son. The widow is left destitute, her money invested in the house and shop passing to her husband's heir.

It is to remedy such cases of injustice as this that ladies ask to have the suffrage conferred on women householders. Observe how differently the law acts when the husband is the widowed partner: if a wife dies, the law gives the whole of her real property to her husband for his life.—*Englishwoman's Review*.

## UNEQUAL JUSTICE.

From the *Christian World*.

It is earnestly to be hoped that the efforts making on behalf of the wretched woman, Mary Elizabeth Coward, aged 24, condemned to death for the drowning of her child of shame, will be successful. Though compelled to find her guilty of the deed, the jury recommended her to mercy, and it seemed strange, therefore, to everyone in court, that Mr. Justice Archibald should have passed upon her a sentence of death. Her conduct was, no doubt, "heartless" enough, but so was that of several other women, tried for a similar crime at the same assizes, who were sentenced only to imprisonment; and the severity of the judgment is increased by the fact that the culprit is said to be of weak intellect, besides being wicked. If it be, as some say, that the crime of infanticide is increasing of late, one is tempted to ask whether other means of checking it instead of imposing heavier penalties upon the miserable mothers, might not be resorted to. The strength of a woman's affection for her offspring is such that, in nine cases out of ten, we may be sure she is driven to desperation by circumstances if she takes its life. Thus the question forces itself upon one—Is not the father in most cases even more guilty than the mother, albeit he may have had no hand in the actual murder? And yet, as matters stand at present, there is rarely even a word of censure uttered by either barrister or judge against the coward who has slunk away from his partner in sin, much less is he sought for and placed by her side in the dock. Till this shall be done we are very far, surely, in these cases from dealing out even-handed justice. No doubt there are many difficulties in the way of bringing this about, but they ought to be grappled with and overcome. It is infinitely pitiful to see poor, ignorant girls, whether led astray or wilfully corrupt, who have yielded to the sore temptation to put the fruits of their immorality out of the

way, placed in the dock, and all the ponderous machinery of the law set in motion, at great cost to the nation, to punish them with lengthened periods of penal servitude or with death, and to know that no notice is taken of the scoundrel who was the moving agent in the whole tragedy. Law to the thoughtful onlooker seems to be a farce, and justice only a name. We wonder how it is that our restless advocates for woman's rights have not set themselves with the utmost determination to bring about a radical reform in this matter. There can be little doubt that if they did so, the common sense and right feeling of the entire nation would support their demands.

## REVIEWS.

*The Year Book of Women's Work*. Edited by L. M. H. Price 1s.—*Labour News* Publishing Office, 1, Long Acre, W.C.

This excellent little volume contains a wonderful amount of information relative to the pursuits now ordinarily followed by women, and to those in which they are engaged more rarely. It is dedicated to the Men of England, "in full reliance upon their chivalry as men, and their justice as Englishmen." Summing up the many hindrances to a woman desirous of obtaining her livelihood,—ignorance of the market value of her labour, want of training, false pride, objection to publicity, inexactness in arranging the duties of a situation, etc., L. M. H. truly says, "It is not the situations that are wanting. We constantly hear of openings for employment," but women are not qualified as yet to fill them. We must hope that the time is coming when good, skilled, steady, and well-paid work will be considered as dignifying to a woman as to a man.

Miss Hubbard devotes the first chapter to domestic and public employments—hospital and school superintendents, superintendents of creches, matrons of penitentiaries, prisons, and lunatic asylums; managers of servants' homes, overseers of women in factories, and parish workers (of these last there are 387 in London alone). Private domestic employments include servants (of whom London has 242,564), secretaries and readers, companions and lady-couriers. Suggestions are given about all these occupations.

The positions under the local and Government boards are those of matrons of workhouses, telegraph clerks, and post-mistresses. The post of registrar is open to women; and it is suggested that the office of public vaccinator, at present filled by the already hard-worked medical officer, could be adequately occupied by women.

Education forms a chapter by itself, and is well and clearly treated. A list of training schools is added, and another of the principal examining bodies. "Private teaching is now being daily more closed to persons not holding some kind of certificate." A new demand has lately arisen for teachers in Kindergarten schools.

Under the heading of *Literary work* are lecturers, school-board visitors, translators, and readers to publishers. It is suggested that women would make excellent reporters and shorthand writers; this is, as yet, learned only by a few. Artistic work includes photography, wood engraving, art, needlework, decoration of houses; women are already working at all of these, and ample instructions are given how to set about learning them. In medicine, women have been occasionally oculists and dentists, and the occupations of midwifery and pharmacy are open to them. Nursing—private, district, and hospital—employs a large number of women, and it is on the whole not so ill paid as some employments.

Under the chapter of industrial work we find of course printers, perfumery makers, hairdressers, artificial florists, bookbinders, machinists, dressmakers, and a number of women

occupying other and less well known trades. The average wages earned, and the length of time required in apprenticeships are in most cases given. Some idea may be formed of the multifarious nature of these occupations in looking over a list of 190 which are followed in London. There are only a few women who are machine makers, but there are more than 10,000 machinists; 5,192 bookbinders, but only 220 printers; there is one thimble maker, and many other workers in metals. One good suggestion is that women might be more extensively occupied in gardening, visiting waitresses, and professional menders; when these last are skilful and steady, they are eagerly employed.

The tabulated list of homes, institutions, and associations for the benefit of women, at the end, will be found very useful. There is also a list of the best books, pamphlets, and newspapers discussing these questions. Anyone desirous of knowing how they can aid women's work and women's education should read this book, whose cheapness places it within the reach of all.

*Out of Court.* By Mrs. Cashel Hoey. In three volumes. Hurst & Blackett, 13, Great Marlborough Street, London, 1874.

The scope of this journal precludes us from the attempt to deal with general subjects in politics or literature, and we seldom feel at liberty to notice any work which does not directly or indirectly bear upon our special question; but we are tempted by our appreciation of Mrs. Cashel Hoey's admirable novel to deviate for once from our rule. We can plead in justification that the authoress has introduced into her story exemplifications of a true and notable type of womanhood; and that she lifts us altogether above the region in which heroines of the conventionally sweetly feminine order make divinities out of such commonplace mortals as Crosbie or Phineas Finn. *Out of Court* is a tale of modern life, and any one of the characters might be met in London society without exciting remark as to their singularity. Yet are the heroes and heroines of the true heroic mould. The large-hearted and sound-minded Marcia Keith sheds a pleasant and wholesome influence over the story and its readers. She bears her sorrows *womanfully*, and when at the end of the third volume a happy future seems about to dawn for her, the reader feels that it has been nobly earned. Her maiden aunt, Miss Keith, the shrewd and kindly old Scotch lady with her love of "authentic lace," obtains an almost equal place in our affections. The end of the story, the restoration of an erring wife, points the moral of the motto which the authoress has placed on the title page, "The Gospel checks the Law which throws the stone," and affords an example of the practice of that peculiarly Christian doctrine, the redemption of woman, which has for eighteen hundred years been systematically rejected and set at nought by the professed followers of Him who said "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her."

#### CORRESPONDENCE.

##### THE INTERPRETATION OF WOMEN'S VIEWS.

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

Madam.—I have seen in the *Spectator* an article about Dr. Kenealy in Parliament, in which, alluding to the people who believe in "The Claimant," they say something to this effect, "That in the day when the 'dim common populations' come to believe that there is no one to interpret their views and feelings to the House of Commons, the power of the House of Commons will have passed away." For one man of the poorer classes who feels that he is unable to make his views and those of his class felt in the House of Commons, and who feels irritation and a sense of danger in consequence, there are scores of women of the same

classes, and even higher, who feel this inability, and the same or greater sense of danger, while at the same time such women are so vividly aware of their own vitality and individuality, that no amount of casuistry will persuade them that it is their duty to live what life they can under that sense of danger, without an attempt to rescue themselves from it by the only constitutional means—representation.—Yours sincerely,  
ISABELLA M. S. TOD.

##### THE LAW FOR MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY.

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

Dear Madam,—Will you, or any of your readers, kindly inform me in whose name a Power of Attorney should be given by a married woman with property settled to her separate use? Is it in her own name? or in her own and her husband's? or in the name of her trustee? In a curious case which has arisen in reference to the matter, the three varieties have been provided by two solicitors; and a third gentleman, a land agent, says that the law is uncertain with regard to it, though its use in some cases cannot be dispensed with.—I am, dear madam, yours,  
ONE PERPLEXED.

[We cannot undertake to decide legal questions, but we print the letter as an illustration of the vexatious and uncertain condition of the laws affecting the property rights of women.—Ed. W. S. J.]

##### WOMEN AND THE VILLAGE COMMUNITIES OF RUSSIA.

In the August number of *Macmillan's Magazine* contains an article on self-government in Russia, from which we extract the following account of the part sometimes taken by women in their local affairs:—

"Indeed, though legally the women have no voice in the government of the village, they sometimes take upon themselves to protest against the resolutions passed by their husbands in favour of keeping open the spirit-shops; and an address in this sense was quite recently agreed to by the women of Olkhovo, a village of Novgorod, and duly forwarded to the governor of that province. 'Whereas,' said the unhappy women (their petition was published in the *Golos, or Voice*, of St. Petersburg)—'whereas our husbands have empowered Karnila Lushin to keep open a public-house during the year 1875, we hereby certify that Karnila Lushin first made them drunk with brandy. Consequently our children have no bread, we have sometimes no cattle, no homes, and for a long time we have paid no *obrok* to our landlords. Our husbands are intoxicated not only on holidays, but all the week through. At the same time, we and our children, who can work, have no rest for gaining our bread. We are reduced to the necessity of electing our peasant-wife Matrona Savelieva as a deputy to the highest authorities, that she may ask them to do us the benefit to cancel this act of our husbands.'

"In other parts of Russia the women have shown a similar disposition to take affairs into their own hands, and, sometimes, on similar provocation. In the province of Kalouga, however, as stated by the local *Gazette*, so many men are absent from the villages, that if their wives and mothers who remain at home were not to take part in the communal assemblies, nothing could be done. It would even be impossible to form the legal quorum of thirteen, which in one village was composed of five men and eight women. According to this authority, the presence of a majority of women in the assembly has an excellent effect. 'The women,' says the *Kalouga Gazette*, 'do not drink, like the men, and cannot, like them, be corrupted by liquor.' At a village in the district of Taross, a man, 'presumably unfitted for the office of churchwarden,' to which he

##### A WOMAN'S SPIRIT IN RAILWAY ENTERPRISE.

The following extract from "The Life and Labours of Mr. Brassey," by the late Sir Arthur Helps, may serve to show one more instance of the capabilities of women.

"Mrs. Brassey has survived her husband. It is always a difficult matter to speak in praise of those who are living, and who may not like to read commendation of themselves; but, notwithstanding this necessary reserve, it is right to mention the fact that Mr. Brassey's first connection with railways was partly due to the advice which he received from his wife. He naturally hesitated to leave Birkenhead, where he had established a large and increasing business, but his wife's spirit and sound judgment convinced her that her husband would be able to find a far more important sphere for the exercise of his great abilities by enlisting in the small band of men who had at that time taken in hand the construction of railways. This may now seem a thoroughly self-evident proposition, but it was not so then. . . . People maintained that these newfangled concerns might do to convey heavy goods (as improved tramways), but as for carrying passengers, with any comfort or safety, that was a ludicrous supposition. It was a very courageous thing for any woman to hold a contrary opinion, and to hold it so firmly that she should venture to advise her husband to throw in his fortunes with the new and much depreciated class of enterprise. Mr. Brassey followed his wife's advice, and to her therefore is due in no slight degree, the successful career of this remarkable man."

As we have Sir Arthur Helps' book before us, we may add that he is clearly in favour of the advancement of women to higher and wider fields of employment, as these words will testify.

"One of the principal charms in the character of women is that they are eminently appreciative. Let us hope that when they take a larger share—the share that justice and reason admit—in the active labours of the world, they will not lose any portion of this charm." The poet Coleridge maintained that the greatest men are those in whom something of the feminine nature is conjoined with the sterner qualities of the masculine character. If this be the case, Mr. Brassey might certainly claim that element of greatness, for he had that tender and respectful regard for the distinguishing merits of his fellowmen which especially belongs to the highest order of womankind.

##### MR. THACKERAY ON MEN'S THOUGHTS OF WOMEN.

Thackeray, speaking of women, says:—"Our habit is to despise them; we believe they do not think because they do not contradict us; and are weak because they do not struggle and rise up against us. A man only begins to know women as he grows old; and for my part my opinion of their cleverness rises every day. . . . In the bargain we make with them I don't think they get their rights. . . . I doubt whether we get the most out of our women by enslaving them as we do by law and custom. . . . There are some folks who would limit the range of a woman's duty to little more than a kitchen range—others who like them to administer to our delectation in a ballroom, and permit them to display dimpled shoulders and flowing ringlets, just as you have one horse for a mill and another for the park. . . . It was we who made the laws for women, who, we are in the habit of saying, are not so clever as we are. As I grow old and consider these things I know which are the stronger, men or women, but which are the cleverer I doubt."—*Sketches in London.*

aspired, gave drink to the male peasants, and gained their votes. But the women of the village didn't drink, and seeing what sort of a man he was, rejected him. The writer further affirms that a retired soldier, arriving at the district town of Taross to draw his pension, and having to present a certificate of identity from the assembly of his village, produced one on which the signatures were for the most part those of women.

"Village assemblies, however, are at the bottom of the scale of self-governing organisations; and whatever good may be done by women at these communal meetings, they would not be admitted to the assemblies of *volosts*, or groups of villages, at which the village communities are represented by deputies."

##### MORE TESTIMONY FROM WYOMING.

C. R. Patterson, editor of the *Ypsilanti (Mich.) Commercial*, last year addressed a letter to Governor Campbell, of Wyoming, relative to the working of woman suffrage in that Territory. The *Commercial* prints the following reply from the Governor in its issue of July 11:

"Ex. Office, Wyoming Territory, Cheyenne, July 1, 1874.  
"Mr. C. R. Patterson: Dear Sir—In regard to your inquiries as to the success of woman suffrage in this Territory, its influences upon the women and the men, whether good or bad, and its effect upon the body politic in repressing crime and exalting virtue, I would respond affirmatively in every way. I send you a copy of my message of last November as an expression of my views. Michigan, rich in every element—material, intellectual, and moral—that goes to make up a State, with her famous university, and no less famous common school system, needs this beneficent reform superadded to constitute her a truly Republican Commonwealth and the model State of the Union. Wyoming has taken the lead of the territories in adopting this reform. We trust that Michigan will pioneer her sister States.—Yours very truly,  
J. A. CAMPBELL."

The *Laramie Daily Sentinel*, of last month, contained an editorial summary of the practical results of woman suffrage, after five years trial in Wyoming, from which we take the following extract:—

"We did not have a single election here without drunkenness, rowdyism, quarrelling, fighting and bloodshed, until our wives, mothers, sisters and daughters were permitted to accompany us to the polls. We well remember the time when many a man stayed away from the polls, losing his rights of citizenship, rather than encounter the danger and rowdyism he must meet in order to exercise it.

"But all this is changed. Our elections go off as quietly as any other social gathering, no matter how heated a political campaign may be, or how important the issues at stake. And we all point with pride to the result, whether or not we agree as to the cause which has produced it."

The *Lansing Republican* administers this rebuke to a certain class of Michigan papers, who say in one column that if the women wanted the ballot, they would vote to give it to them, and then in another column proceed to throw mud at every woman who does want it. It says: "'Womanly' women, of course, do not wish to mingle in politics, if they are to be ridiculed and abused for it. Some editors and politicians so scurrilously oppose woman suffrage, that most women dare not speak out, and then these men oppose woman suffrage, because women do not speak out. Is this fair and manly? We were once told that the Southern negroes cared nothing about freedom, because, when under the lash, and in sight of the bloodhound, they declared that they were perfectly happy."

MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS RECEIVED DURING AUGUST, 1875.

	£	s.	d.
Mr. H. M. Steinthal (Lecture Fund)...	20	0	0
Mr. William Birch, junr. ....	3	3	0
Mrs. Mills (Tooting) ....	2	2	0
Mr. William Lee ....	2	2	0
H. S. ....	2	0	0
Mr. A. Haworth ....	1	1	0
Mrs. McCulloch (Lecture Fund)...	1	0	0
Mrs. McKinnel ( " )...	1	0	0
Dr. Muirhead ....	1	0	0
Mr. J. F. Roberts ....	1	0	0
Mr. John Marsden ....	0	10	6
Miss H. Mills (Harpurhey) ....	0	10	6
Mr. J. Bowron, jun. ....	0	10	0
Miss Stuart ....	0	5	0
Miss A. Wilson... ..	0	5	0
Miss S. P. Mackenzie ....	0	5	0
Mr. R. Sutcliffe ....	0	5	0
Mrs. R. Sutcliffe ....	0	5	0
Mr. Holderness... ..	0	5	0
Mrs. Murray (Lecture fund)...	0	5	0
Mrs. Samuel ( " )...	0	2	6
Mr. James Waugh ....	0	2	6
A Friend (Oxford) ....	0	2	6
Mrs. Kilminster ....	0	2	6
Mrs. Lomas ....	0	2	6
H. R. ....	0	2	6
Mrs. Griffith ....	0	2	6
Miss Alice Dalby ....	0	2	0
J. R. ....	0	1	0
Mrs. Elizabeth R. Scott... ..	0	10	0
Collected by Miss K. Richards ...	0	6	6
" Mrs. Nordering ....	0	6	0
" Mrs. Turner ....	0	3	0
" Mrs. Teschemacher... ..	1	0	4
Mrs. Poole... ..	0	2	6
Smaller Sums ... ..			

COINE.

Mrs. Armstrong ... ..	0	10	0
Mrs. Ayrton ... ..	0	10	0
Captain Barker... ..	0	5	0
Miss Bracewell ... ..	0	5	0
A. C. ....	0	5	0
Mrs. Threlfall ... ..	0	5	0
Mr. C. Tatham ... ..	0	2	6
Rev. J. P. Moorhouse ... ..	0	2	6
Mr. W. H. Carr ... ..	0	2	6
Mrs. A. A. Nelson ... ..	0	2	0
Mr. John Horsfield ... ..	0	1	6
Miss S. H. Marsden... ..	0	2	0
Smaller Sums ... ..			

£45 0 10

S. ALFRED STEINTHAL.

Cheques and Post Office Orders should be made payable to the Treasurer, Rev. S. ALFRED STEINTHAL, and may be sent either direct to him at 81, Nelson-street; or to the Secretary, Miss BECKER, 28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester.

WOMEN AS POST OFFICE CLERKS.—The following is an extract from the first report of the Civil Service Inquiry Commission, published February 5th, 1875:—"We have taken evidence regarding the employment of female clerks. The experience of the Post Office, as will be seen by the evidence, shows that women are well qualified for clerical work of a less important character, and are satisfied with a lower rate of pay than is expected by men similarly employed. We, therefore, see no reason why the employment of female clerks should not be extended to other departments where the circumstances will admit of it.

Siamese Conservatives are deeply indignant over an innovating proposition to repeal the law which permits a man to pawn his wife or to stake her at a game of chance. Hitherto the husband has been the better, his spouse the betted, half.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

Contributions to the funds of the Central Committee of the National Society for Women's Suffrage, 294, Regent Street, London, W., from June 20th to August 20th, 1875.

	£	s.	d.
Mr. J. P. Mellor ... ..	100	0	0
Mr. and Mrs. Inray ... ..	2	2	0
The Knight of Kerry ... ..	2	0	0
Mrs. Ogden ... ..	2	0	0
For sale of work ... ..	1	10	0
Dr. A. Hassall ... ..	1	1	0
Mrs. Crompton Jones ... ..	1	1	0
Mrs. Harriet Martineau ... ..	1	1	0
Mr. Edward Spender ... ..	1	1	0
Mrs. E. C. Sterling ... ..	1	1	0
Mrs. Garth Wilkinson ... ..	1	1	0
Honourable Auberon and Lady Florence Herbert ... ..	1	0	0
Mr. Frederick Hill ... ..	1	0	0
Mrs. Murietta ... ..	1	0	0
Mr. Tewson ... ..	1	0	0
Mr. James Benham... ..	0	10	6
Mrs. W. Fawcett ... ..	0	10	6
Mrs. Eiloart ... ..	0	10	0
Miss Mulholland ... ..	0	10	0
Mrs. Tennant ... ..	0	10	0
Mrs. Carvell Williams ... ..	0	10	0
Miss Anderson ... ..	0	5	0
Mrs. Rycroft Best ... ..	0	5	0
Mrs. Bolton ... ..	0	5	0
Miss W. Taylor... ..	0	5	0
Mr. T. Wilson ... ..	0	5	0
Anonymous ... ..	0	3	0

£122 7 0

ALFRED W. BENNETT, Treasurer.

After September 29th the Central Committee will remove from their present office to 64, Berners Street, W.

BRISTOL AND WEST OF ENGLAND SOCIETY.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS FOR AUGUST, 1875.

	£	s.	d.
Mrs. Jacob Bright ... ..	50	0	0
A Friend ... ..	50	0	0
Lady Anna Gore-Langton ... ..	20	0	0
Mr. Sommerville ... ..	4	0	0
Mr. Herbert Thomas ... ..	2	2	0
Mr. John Lucas ... ..	1	1	0
Mrs. Thomas Thomas ... ..	1	1	0
The Rev. U. R. Thomas ... ..	1	1	0
Mrs. S. W. Browne... ..	1	0	0
Mrs. Carlslake ... ..	1	0	0
Mr. C. H. James ... ..	1	0	0
Miss Leonard ... ..	1	0	0
Mr. F. James ... ..	0	10	6
Mrs. Evans... ..	0	10	0
Mrs. James... ..	0	10	0
Mrs. Phillips ... ..	0	10	0
Mrs. Shipley ... ..	0	10	0
Mrs. N. Price ... ..	0	6	6
Mr. A. Hellyar... ..	0	5	0
The Rev. W. James... ..	0	5	0
Mr. Jennings ... ..	0	5	0
Mrs. Neild ... ..	0	5	0
Mr. Tucker ... ..	0	5	0
Miss J. Venning ... ..	0	5	0
The Rev. T. Wilkinson ... ..	0	5	0
Mrs. Bond ... ..	0	2	6
Mr. Cotterell ... ..	0	2	6
Mrs. Fardon ... ..	0	2	6
Mr. Gawler ... ..	0	1	6
Mrs. Curnock ... ..	0	1	0
Mr. Pakeman ... ..	0	1	0

£138 8 0

ALICE GRENFELL, 5, Albert Villas, Clifton, Treasurer.  
Office: 53, Park Street, Bristol.

The Duchess of Leeds has been elected a member of the School Board for the parish of Stapleford, Cambridgeshire.

Among the young ladies who are attending the course of lectures in the St. Petersburg Academy of Medicine this year, are two Mahommedan women who have completed their preliminary studies in a school at Odessa.