

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

VOL. VI.—NO. 70. PUBLISHED MONTHLY.
REGISTERED FOR TRANSMISSION ABROAD.

DECEMBER 1, 1875.

PRICE ONE PENNY.
BY POST THREE HALFPENCE.

THE Annual Meeting of the Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage took place on November 10th, under the presidency of Mr. JACOB BRIGHT. A letter was read from Mr. FORSYTH, M.P., who expressed his regret that he had been unexpectedly prevented from attending the meeting, to which he wished all success. He congratulated the supporters of Women's Suffrage on the position and prospects of the question. Not only had there been no falling off in the influence and support the measure had obtained, but on the contrary, the movement in its favour had steadily and largely increased. He mentioned that a society or committee, including some members of Parliament, had been formed for the purpose of defeating the measure in Parliament. This was an unusual proceeding, for except in the case of Catholic Emancipation, he had never heard of a society got up to oppose a claim of political rights. The supporters of the Bill might take this as a testimony to the progress of the movement, since its opponents were driven to adopt extraordinary means to oppose its progress. He concluded by asking the Society to continue their work, and show by petitions and other constitutional means how widespread is the desire of women to be admitted within the pale of political rights.

The Report of the Society reviewed the events of the past session, which were regarded as very favourable to the prospects of the measure. Although the second reading of the Bill was lost, the majority against it was so greatly diminished as to afford a presumption that the present House of Commons is more favourable to the principle than was its predecessor. During the last Parliament, the numbers who voted against the Bill remained for five successive years persistently at the number 220 to 222; while in the new Parliament, the opponents, in spite of the most energetic whipping of both sides of the House, only mustered 187. For the first time in the history of the measure it had obtained a majority of the Liberal votes recorded, and the proportionate number of supporters on the Conservative side of the House had also greatly increased. A majority of the new members not in the last Parliament who took part in the division voted for the

Bill. The strength of the opposition appears to be in the remnant of the old House of Commons. Turning from members to constituencies, increased support for the measure is found. Six three-cornered constituencies gave either their full vote, or each a majority of their members which are favourable to the Bill. Thirty-four constituencies, as against twenty-four in the last Parliament, return each two members who are supporters of the measure; and eighty-seven constituencies, as against seventy in the last House of Commons, return as their single member one favourable to the Bill. Twenty-seven constituencies gave one vote each for the Bill, their other vote being neutral in the last division. We have therefore 117 constituencies, as against 94 in the last Parliament, giving undivided support, and 144 constituencies clearly ranged in favour of the measure. The Committee also report a considerable increase in the number of members of the Society. The financial statement showed an increase both of income and expenditure over the past year.

The CHAIRMAN said that he had always most confidence in this cause after reading the speeches of the adversaries. After reading the debate in the House of Commons he came to the conclusion that if all the arguments used against them were put together and presented by the most persuasive tongue, they would not carry one meeting out of every twenty that were held throughout the country. We were told that from time immemorial women had had nothing to do with politics, and therefore that the past should govern the future. Our answer to that is simply that it is not true. From time immemorial women have directly or indirectly exerted governmental and political influence. Women have worn the crown in the most critical period of our history, and at times when the will of the SOVEREIGN was subjected to almost no control. But if it were true, what would have been the condition of the world now if the plea of immemorial usage had been allowed to bar every change. The "pedestal" argument has been abandoned; members of Parliament have discovered that every woman is not a fine lady standing on a pedestal more or less exalted, with all her wants gratified from the incense she receives

from surrounding adorers. We have heard something of a shrieking sisterhood, but it appears that the scene is now changed, and that we have in the House of Commons a shrieking brotherhood. The alarm of these excited men is that natural barriers should fall. Speaking of the assumed relation of the vote to the military service, Mr. JACOB BRIGHT remarked that in England of all men who present themselves to the recruiting sergeants with the ambition of defending their country, only those who are reported by the examining officer as being too feeble to serve have any chance of obtaining a vote. The British tar cannot vote, simply because he is not at home. He (Mr. BRIGHT) had received letters from various seaport towns urging this point on his attention, and suggesting that the wives of sailors should give their vote for them. Possibly those who are so anxious for the defenders of our country to have political power, might be willing to adopt women's suffrage up to this point. At any rate, if the sailor either directly or by proxy could have given his vote, Mr. PLIMSOLL would have had an easier task in the great work to which he has devoted his life. We hear much of the pains and penalties of war. Put in the opposite scale the anxieties, the responsibilities, the pains and perils of maternity, and say whether the balance will be restored. In the great scheme of human existence are not the contributions of the two sexes equal? Is not the burden the same? One thing is at least clear, each knows its own wants, and for one sex to claim absolute legal control over the other requires a degree of arrogance which only commoner minds will long retain. We had been attacked in the House of Commons by all the weapons which rhetoric and ridicule could yield, because we support a Bill which would give the franchise to women who were rate-payers, and therefore which would exclude married women. There was one thing wanting to give that argument power, the sincerity of those who used it. Only five years ago these men deliberately and without a dissentient voice, established the school vote on that very principle; yet, that was a time when if the argument was worth anything it would especially have told. There were three reasons why he was satisfied to support such a Bill. First, there is a reason our opponents should receive—there is immemorial usage. From time immemorial in this country that has been the vote which women have enjoyed. Secondly, because there have been two Acts of the Legislature passed within the last seven years, by unanimous Parliaments, confirming that settlement of the case—the

Municipal Act, and the School Board Act. Thirdly, and that was a most important part of the argument, because although not all women, yet the vast majority of women would be satisfied with this settlement. But he would say to the opponents that if the Bill should get into Committee, and they should wish to extend its scope and give a vote to women who are married, provided of course that they happen to have a qualification, he for one should not oppose. They were told that women abuse the franchise. No facts were adduced to support the charge. But if women abuse the franchise they did not return the Claimant's candidate for Stoke. They were not the cause of the disgraceful revelations at Norwich, Boston, and a score of other places. But what was the argument based on the disorder of some voters? It is, some women abuse the franchise—therefore exclude them all. Some men abuse the franchise—admit them all. Those who vote against the inclusion of some 300,000 women are at the same time voting for the inclusion of about one million men in the counties, a considerable portion of whom, from their illiteracy and poverty, are of the very sort which yields those who abuse the franchise. In conclusion he urged the friends of the cause to proceed on the old lines,—to petition Parliament, hold public meetings, and to excite as much as possible discussion. A good cause lives and thrives on debate. They must take to themselves the motto—Without haste, without rest, and the end for which they had so gallantly struggled would inevitably come.

Mrs. OLIVER SCATCHERD, in moving the adoption of the report, said that it had always been the difficulty that women had not to contend with arguments, but with foolish sentiments. They had a right to expect that at least their reasons would be met with reasons, and that they would have something tangible to reply to. A week or two ago Mr. LEATHAM had addressed his constituents, and pleaded earnestly for the admission of agricultural labourers to the franchise, and then proceeded to censure women for applying to their own case the arguments he himself had used. Some of his other remarks were totally unanswerable, not on account of their merit, but because women could not descend to his level of coarse personality and abuse. The speaker proceeded to quote the orderly manner in which a six weeks' lock-out of 28,000 people in the Dewsbury district had been conducted by a committee composed solely of women, to show that working women were capable of managing public business, and added that she found all of these women eagerly desirous to obtain the franchise.

Mr. CHARLEY, M.P., said that the tone of the House of Commons would be raised if women had the suffrage. Women had an intuitive instinct of what was right and wrong, which enabled them to penetrate through the flimsy disguises that imposed upon men, and if a candidate came to them with unctuous phrase and plausible speech, he thought they would examine his credentials more closely than a man would do, and would unmask him if he were undeserving of support. He had been struck with an incident that occurred at Norwich, where a woman at the time of the election said she wore her colours on her heart, while men were going about selling their votes for a few shillings.

Dr. PANKHURST said we had recently had to consider in a great many respects the principles of our representative system. The two poles of the system were justice to all classes, supremacy to none. At this moment the second principle was most in the minds of thoughtful politicians, many of whom were afraid that one class might secure domination in the State, and reproduce in another and a bad form the old principle of class legislation. The simple maxim by which these two grand things had been effected in the history of England or Europe was by giving to all classes places within the system of representation. Once in the representation, no class dominated. Therefore, on the ground of reason, of precedent, and of practice, there could be no reason against the claim of women to come within the limits of the suffrage in order that they might on the one hand obtain justice to themselves and prevent anyone acquiring an undue and improper ascendancy.

We have little to add to the summary of the present position of the question derived from the statements in the report and the speeches at the meeting. But we would commend the able and exhaustive speech of the Chairman to the earnest attention both of friends and opponents of the cause, and likewise to that of thoughtful and candid persons who may not as yet have made up their minds as to its merits. To such we would say that the influence of time, the experience of eight years of practical work, the vicissitudes of party and political conflicts, have but deepened the conviction of the justice and expediency of their cause with which the promoters of the agitation commenced their labours. The object we seek is certain to be attained sooner or later. The principle of women's suffrage was conceded by the Legislature when the Municipal Act was passed; and the application of this principle to the Parliamentary suffrage is a mere question of time, if the demand

be kept up with sufficient perseverance and energy. The sooner this end is attained the sooner will the benefits to be hoped for from it in regard to the amelioration of the general condition of women begin to be felt; and we urge those who desire the coming of these better things to give the society renewed and increased support in their endeavours to obtain the Parliamentary franchise.

WE beg to call attention to the report of the great demonstration in favour of women's suffrage, which took place last week in the constituency of one of its most prominent opponents. The huge gathering was held under the presidency of the MAYOR, in the largest hall in Huddersfield, and the building was densely crowded in every part. The meeting was truly representative of the borough, the leading men of both political parties being present; and it is more especially noteworthy that Mr. LEATHAM's principal supporters came forward in force to mark their dissent from the views of their member on this particular question. The speeches of the ladies who represented the cause were characterised by remarkable ability and grace, and received with hearty favour and applause. Memorials were adopted to Mr. LEATHAM and the members for the county, praying that they would give their support in the House of Commons to the measure. The exigencies of time and space prevent us from giving a full report of all of them.

ACCORDING to Mr. LOUIS STEVENSON, in September's *Maemillan*, JOHN KNOX, the sturdy and redoubted Scotch reformer, fares no better, as far as logic is concerned, in his onslaught on women's rights, than even our friend Mr. LEATHAM, the Quaker, or Mr. SMOLLETT, the witless utterer of coarse and ribald jokes, both of whom have had to bend their backs beneath the well-directed scourge of fair opponents. We must however apologise to the shade of the old Scotchman for placing his name, itself still the very type and image of strength and fearless courage, in juxtaposition with that of Mr. LEATHAM, and still more with that of Mr. SMOLLETT.

Poor JOHN KNOX, vigorous as he was in the use of the dogmatic sledge-hammer, was puzzled in theory what to do with DEBORAH and HULDAH, and still more puzzled both in theory and practice what to do with good QUEEN BESS of immortal fame. Here was Scripture right against him; here was a mighty lady, whose kind offices were of infinite value to him and to his cause, swaying the sceptre of a great kingdom in perilous times, not only reigning but ruling, boxing the ears, if report spoke true, of misbehaving maids

and mistresses of honour, learned, according to dear old ROGER ASCHAM, in all the learning of the ancients, reading more Greek in a day than many Churchmen did Latin in a week, threatening to unfrock recalcitrant prelates—and ready to do it too; what a puzzle was this, if all women were called by GOD to eat humble pie, attend to the making of beds, mending of shirts, and cooking of meats, or at most were only destined to sit in drawing-rooms as ornamental belongings of their lords and masters! So good JOHN KNOX, stout logician as he was, and vigorous controversialist as he had proved himself to be, was driven to the theory of exceptions, the last resource of bewildered and be-muddled brains, and to the special and peculiar interpositions of Divine Providence in special cases. DEBORAH and HULDAH, and ELIZABETH, and all who did not square with the preconceived theories, were exceptions, and the rule was as he would have it to be. And so it is now, and so it ever will be, until men are content to look both facts and arguments in the face, and until their theories are built on facts, instead of facts being cut to lie upon the procrustean bed of theories. Then when we do this Mrs. SOMERVILLE will be an exception only in so far as transcendent genius is an exception, and it will come to be acknowledged that faculties given by GOD were not meant, because they were the heritage of a woman, to be lost to the world at large. C. H. C.

A CURIOUS School Board election has recently taken place at Gosbeck, Suffolk. Five members were to be elected, but it appeared that, of all the candidates nominated, only one nomination was legal in form—that of Mrs. ATTWOOD, the wife of the Vicar. Pursuant to a clause in the Act, which provides that when an insufficient number of candidates are nominated those elected may elect the remainder to fill up the number, Mrs. ATTWOOD took to herself another lady, her husband, and two other gentlemen, and nominated them to form the School Board. At their first meeting, the board so chosen elected the VICAR as chairman, and the lady who had appointed them as honorary clerk. This case affords another example of the anomaly in the present political condition of women. If a woman can be trusted to be the sole elector of a whole School Board, it would seem that a woman might well be trusted with a fraction of the electoral power exercised in sending a member to the House of Commons.

THE present barbarous and cruel fashion of ornamenting ladies' bonnets and hats with the dismembered bodies

of small birds, against which we trust that we may be pardoned for here entering our earnest protest, is rising to the dignity of a social question, and giving occasion for the intervention of magistrates and officers of state. Lately, at Dover, two men were charged with trespass. Upon them were found fifty-one dead larks, and a large number of wrens, linnets, and bullfinches. A gentleman connected with the Customs, who was present in court, stated that a high premium was paid to men like the prisoners, and that it was within his cognisance that only last week some thousands of the finest plumaged birds from Normandy passed through the Custom House on their way to one well-known firm in London, their destination being to ornament ladies' hats and bonnets. The Bench expressed their determination to punish any future offenders, and a communication on the subject was ordered to be sent by the clerk to the HOME SECRETARY.

We wish that the ladies of England would relieve the HOME SECRETARY from all troubles connected with the procuring of ornaments for their hats, by contenting themselves with the graceful plumage of domesticated birds, which now include ostriches, and which may be obtained and worn without apparent cruelty, and without inciting anyone to break the law. We believe that the prevailing fashion is supported through sheer thoughtlessness and ignorance, and that if the truth could be brought home to their consciousness, ladies would see in the heads and wings of birds, torn off to place in their hats, not so much the beauty of the objects themselves, as ghastly mementoes of the murderous destruction of myriads of the most lovely, innocent, and useful creatures that gladden the face of the earth. Meanwhile the proved connection between this barbarous fancy and the offences incurred by men who are tempted to lawless courses in order to supply the demand created by it, is another proof that women and their concerns are within the domain of politics, and the sooner they are made to feel their responsibilities the better for themselves and the nation.

THE notion of property in wives fostered by the present legal and political status of women has recently received a curious illustration. A few days ago, as we learn from a local paper, "a number of men were drinking in a public-house on Blakey Moor, Blackburn. One of them was drunk. His wife, a woman of 30, came in, and asked him for money. He said, 'I wish somebody would buy thee.' A machine maker, about 23 years of age, said, 'I'll buy her.' 'Articles of sale,' of which the following is a copy—

names being omitted—were drawn up and signed:—'November 4, 1875. This is to certify that I do hereby sell my wife for the sum of fourpence. Witness my hand, &c.' The purchaser, in celebration of the event, ordered two quarts of ale. Subsequently he and the woman went home together, and on Saturday afternoon they visited the public-house, where they met with the husband, and all seemed happy together. The husband says he is satisfied with the sale, and the woman declares she will not leave her new owner." Transactions of this nature are not new, and are not very uncommon. We do not know whether Mr. LEATHAM considers them a part of the scheme which the experience of ages, sanctioned by Revelation, has designed with regard to the respective spheres of man and woman, but they are certainly the outcome of the state of opinion which sanctions the perpetual subjection of women. They are the rude and uneducated man's version of the declaration of PETRUCHIO: "I will be master of what is mine own. She is my goods, my chattels."

A CORRESPONDENT who signs herself "That Oriental Social Failure, Sister Ann," with the remark that Mrs. Bluebeard was not much of a social success, sends the following newspaper cutting. She thinks that the marital amenities in the macropod *ménage* come to light very *à propos* at the present time as an illustration of the theory that all animate creation has its antitype, despite occasional anomalies, both physically and socially, in that paragon of animals, Man:—

— Instances of animal depravity are not confined to the land. Carl Vogt, the well-known German anthropologist, narrates in *Die Gartenlaube* an incident of life beneath the waves, showing that there are denizens of the deep worthy to rank with the wretches who disfigure and kick to death the women whom they have sworn to cherish. Vogt had a male and female macropod in an aquarium. For a time they got on swimmingly, but after a while a domestic difficulty seems to have intervened, for one day the female was found lying at the bottom of the aquarium with one eye gouged out. She recovered, and again went about her household duties pretty much like a kicker's maimed wife who has condoned the brutality of her husband. Something, however, again occurred to rouse the feelings of the masculine macropod, and for the second time he attacked his loving mate, and extracted the remaining eye with a dexterity that would have done credit to a surgeon removing a diseased limb. What could the motive be? It was not hunger, for they were well fed; and it was not jealousy, for they were alone in the aquarium. Vogt inquires whether there are fishy Borgias and Bluebeards, or if the marine criminal was a Darwinian, trying to develop a new type? The case is a puzzling one. Inherent depravity, which has been used to explain so much of human wickedness, does not apply here. We can only conjecture that the motive was the same as that offered by a person now ornamenting one of Her Majesty's prisons, who kicked and maltreated his wife "to ease his mind."

PUBLIC MEETINGS.

MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR
WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING.

The annual meeting of the National Association for Women's Suffrage was held in the Mayor's Parlour, at the Manchester Town Hall, on November 10th. The meeting was largely composed of ladies. Mr. Jacob Bright presided; and there was a large attendance.

Miss BECKER read the following letter from Mr. Forsyth, M.P.:—

Temple, November 3rd, 1875.

My dear Miss Becker,—I am very sorry that I shall be unavoidably prevented from attending the meeting at Manchester on the 10th inst. I need not say that I wish it all success. I think that I may, with good reason, congratulate you and all the supporters of women's suffrage on the position and prospects of the question. Not only has there not been any falling off in interest and support, but on the contrary the movement in favour of it has steadily and largely increased. It seems to me that the weight of argument on the side of those who contend that persons who possess every other qualification to entitle them to the franchise should not be disqualified simply and solely on the ground of sex, is so great that the sense of justice and fairness, which is the characteristic of Englishmen, will not long allow them to deny to that argument its practical effect. I believe that a society or committee, including several members of Parliament, has been formed for the purpose of defeating, if possible, the Women's Suffrage Bill. This is a rather unusual proceeding, for, except in the case of Catholic Emancipation, I never before heard of a society got up to oppose a claim to political rights. But you may take it as a compliment, and an admission from your opponents that they think the claim which they seek to frustrate requires extraordinary means to combat. The only advice I can give you is simply to persevere. Appeal by argument and reason to the calm judgment of the nation, and show by the number of petitions to Parliament how widespread is the desire of introducing women within the pale of political rights; and I cannot doubt that the effort to remove an invidious and injurious restriction will be rewarded by success.—Yours very truly,

W. FORSYTH.

Miss Becker stated that letters had also been received from the Right Hon. J. Stansfeld, M.P., Mr. Callender, M.P., Mr. Cawley, M.P., Mr. J. K. Cross, M.P., Mr. Burt, M.P., Mr. Pennington, M.P., Mr. Hopwood, M.P., Mr. Hugh Mason, Mr. J. C. Cox, Rev. W. N. Molesworth, Mrs. Winkworth, Mrs. Alfred Osler, Mr. Thomas Dale, and Professor and Mrs. Sheldon Amos. She then read the annual report, which has been published in another form.

Rev. S. A. STEINTHAL (hon. treasurer) read the financial statement, which showed that the income for the year, including a balance of £474 from last year, was £2,222. The principal sources of income were subscriptions and donations £1,415, and receipts from the *Journal* £252. The expenditure was £2,087, leaving a balance of £135. The principal items were: Salaries and office expenditure, £548; postage and telegrams, £178; public meetings, £406; canvassing, £358; and printing, £363. The liabilities amount to £381, and the subscriptions, &c., received since the accounts were made up to £213.

The CHAIRMAN said: I have always the most confidence in this cause after reading the speeches of our adversaries. When

I was asked to preside over this meeting I turned to the last debate in the House of Commons, and after reading it carefully I came to the conclusion that if all the arguments used against us were put together and presented by the most persuasive tongue, they would not carry one meeting out of every twenty that you hold in the country. I think this explains the reason why our opponents take the somewhat un-English course of getting up a semi-secret society in Parliament instead of meeting you upon your platforms, where, if their cause is good, they might suppress this movement at its source. No new arguments were produced. Old ones were made to look as much like new as possible by the ambitious language in which they were clothed. I would call your attention for a short time to the more prominent of these arguments. The first was that of immemorial usage. We were told that from time immemorial women had had nothing to do with politics, and therefore that the past should govern the future. Our answer to that is simply that it is not true. From time immemorial women have directly or indirectly exerted governmental and political influence. I won't travel into distant countries or go to distant times; I will simply remind you that in your own country women have worn the crown in the most critical periods of our history, and at times when the will of the Sovereign was subjected to almost no control. But if what our opponents say were true I would like to ask you what would have been the condition of the world now if the plea of immemorial usage had been allowed to bar every change. I should have respected this argument more if it had come from the Conservative side of the House, because it would have been in some degree at least in harmony with the ordinary professions of the Conservative party; but coming as it does from below the gangway on the Liberal side of the House, where startling propositions are constantly made, I think I might be almost justified in treating it as a joke. The "pedestal" argument has been abandoned. Members of Parliament have discovered that every woman is not a fine lady, standing on a pedestal more or less exalted, with all her wants gratified by the incense she receives from surrounding adorers. The argument which our opponents seem to rely on more than any other is what, for the sake of brevity, I may call "the spherical" argument. We were gravely told that the whole sum of human duties resolved itself into two distinct spheres. Now, whoever can make that statement seriously must either be dreaming or be unusually ignorant of the world in which he lives. If it were true you might draw a line through the whole breadth of human affairs, and put men on one side of it and women on the other. But what are the facts? Men and women mingle freely together in most of the occupations of life. You have men and women operatives. You have men and women agricultural labourers and farmers. Men and women are earning their livelihood together in domestic service, in shops, in Government departments, and on the stage. They are taking part in the same debates in trade-union congresses, and in the Social Science and British Associations. They are sharing the attention of the world in art productions. You find them together in the highest walks of literature; and in some communities, as is well known, every Sabbath day they expound the law of God to cultivated audiences with the equal authority. There are occupations which men possess alone, in some cases because of artificial, in others because of natural, barriers. Artificial barriers must come down. Every league you travel, from east to west, you see them coming down. Natural barriers will remain. We have heard something of "a shrieking sisterhood." It appears to me that the scene is changed, and we have now in the House of Commons a shrieking brotherhood. The alarm of these excited men is lest the natural barriers should

fall. They are afraid that nature will cease to execute her own laws. Women no doubt are capable of doing foolish things, but I have never found them assuming so absurd an attitude as this. Now, if the strength which men possess were necessary to write a book, or preach a sermon, or paint a picture, men would by right divine have a monopoly of these occupations, and no excited member of Parliament would require to get up elaborate orations in order to protect them from the invasion of the other sex. Just the same with regard to representative government. If in order to enjoy the privilege bodily strength were needed, men, of course, would have the monopoly of it to the end of time; but the advantage of the representative system is that it adapts itself to the weak—to those who more especially need its protection. The machinery is very simple. You have the best newspapers, perhaps, which the world has ever known entering your houses every day, almost for nothing, giving you all the information you require for the performance of political duties. You have within a few hundred yards of your houses every five or six years the ballot box established, and if you put your paper into that box you influence Parliament, without neglecting a single home duty, and without lessening in the slightest degree the privacy you may wish to enjoy in your lives. So much for the "spherical" argument. The objection that because women are excused from personally defending their country therefore they should be denied a vote was again used. Now if there were force in that argument I do not think it should be employed by a member of the Society of Friends—(laughter)—and yet Mr. Leatham reproduced it in the last debate. For more than two centuries no member of the Society of Friends has ever been willing to shoulder a musket or to handle a sword; and I honour them for this standing protest of theirs against the reign of brute force. (Applause.) They have paid for defence as other persons have paid; but if the taxes had been collected separately, and for separate objects—if, for example, you had had a tax for the army and navy, as a matter of necessity, and in harmony with the course they have taken with regard to tithes and church rates, the Friends would have refused to pay. But women everywhere would have cheerfully paid, and therefore it seems to me that women stand somewhat nearer to the duty of the personal defence of the country than even Mr. Leatham himself. (Laughter and applause.) Let me look a little closer at this assumed relation of the vote to the military service. In England of all the men who present themselves to the recruiting sergeant with the ambition of defending their country, only those who are rejected by the examining doctor as being too feeble for some cause or other to serve have any chance of obtaining a vote. The British tar cannot vote, simply because he is not at home. When I was in the House of Commons I received letters from various seaport towns urging this grievance of the sailor upon my attention, proposing that he should vote by proxy, and suggesting that the wives of the sailors should give their vote for them. I should think that those of our opponents who are so anxious for all the defenders of the country to have political power would probably be willing to adopt women's suffrage up to this point. At any rate this you will admit, that if the sailor directly or by proxy could have given his vote Mr. Plimsoll would have had an easier task in the great work to which he has devoted his life. How does this military objection to the enfranchisement of women appear in the light of the present condition of Europe? You have I cannot tell you how many millions of men on the continent disciplined for destruction and slaughter. You have therefore millions of women, regardless of the great doctrine of the two distinct spheres, entering upon the occupations which the men have left behind. Upon the labour of these women to a large

extent must depend the wants of the family and the requirements of the State. Supposing there should come a desire in the hearts of these women for political enfranchisement, as we see now in England and America, would the claim of those who are engaged in the beneficent work of production be set aside as worthless, while that of men banded together only for destruction would be accepted as a matter of course? Such an idea would be in perfect harmony with an age of barbarism. I submit that it is out of place in an age of civilisation. We hear much of the pains and penalties of war. Put into the opposite scale the anxieties, the responsibilities, the pains and penalties of maternity, and tell me whether you have restored the balance. In the great scheme of human existence are not the contributions of the two sexes equal? Is not the burden the same? One thing at least is clear—each knows its own wants, and for one sex, throughout all time, to claim absolute legal control over the other requires, in my judgment, a degree of arrogance which only the commoner minds will long retain. (Applause.) We were attacked in the House of Commons by all the weapons which rhetoric and ridicule could yield, because we support a Bill which would give the franchise to women who are ratepayers, and, therefore, which would exclude married women. There was one thing wanting to give that argument power—namely, the sincerity of those who used it. Why, only five years ago these men deliberately, and without a dissentient voice, established the school vote upon that very principle, and yet that was a time when, if their argument was worth anything, it would especially have told, because they could of course have said, "Here you propose to give to women some control over the education of children; surely you will give it to those women who have children, or, in other words, to married women." Now, I will tell you why I am satisfied to support such a Bill. There are three reasons, and whatever be their independent weight, I maintain that, taken together, they form a powerful argument. First—and this is a reason our opponents should receive—there is immemorial usage. From time immemorial in this country that has been the vote which women have enjoyed. Secondly, because there have been two acts of the Legislature passed within the last seven years by unanimous Parliaments confirming that settlement of the case; I mean the Municipal Act and the School Board Act. Thirdly—and this is a most important part of the argument—because, although not all women, yet the vast majority of women would be satisfied with the settlement. But I would say to our opponents that if ever this Bill should come into committee, and they should wish to extend its scope, and to give a vote to women who are married, provided, of course, they happen to have a property or occupation qualification, I for one should not oppose—(laughter); for I don't disguise the fact that every Woman Suffrage Society in this country is based upon the principle that a woman who has a qualification which enables a man to vote should herself have the franchise. (Hear, hear.) There is an argument that I have heard which, to my mind, is more practical than those to which I have been endeavouring to reply. We are told that women abuse the franchise. We are not told where or how. No facts are adduced to support the charge. I looked the other day with much interest at the Manchester papers in order to see what had been the character of the great elections in this city and in Salford on the 1st of this month. I think there was a unanimous admission on the part of the writers in the press that the elections had gone off with admirable order. Very few incidents were recorded, but there was one. Amongst the illiterates—and I think I should state that I could show there was a smaller proportion of illiterates in this municipal election than I have seen in some Parliamentary elections—

there was one woman who voted for Mr. Ben Brierley, a literary man of deserved reputation amongst us; and in giving her vote she said she voted for Mr. Brierley because he was an educator of the people. That was not a bad thing for an illiterate woman to do. But to show how much she valued the vote she asked what there was to pay. She was willing to pay for it, so much did she prize it. They told her that there was nothing to pay, but she would not leave the booth until she had actually paid for some refreshment for the presiding officer. (Laughter.) Now, women abuse the franchise. Undoubtedly they do. If they did not they would be so unlike men that an argument would be founded upon it against giving them the same privileges as men. But though women abuse the franchise they did not return the Claimant's candidate for Stoke. They were not the cause of the disgraceful revelations at Norwich, Boston, and a score of other places. But what is the argument based on the disorder of some voters? It is—some women abuse the franchise, therefore exclude them all; some men abuse the franchise, admit them all. To my mind that is the rankest injustice. Those who will vote against the inclusion of some 300,000 women are at the same time voting for the inclusion of about one million men in the counties, a considerable portion of whom, unfortunately from their illiteracy and poverty, are of the very sort which yields those who abuse the franchise. One word about the tone of the debate. You were abused, of course, and you have no right to complain. Nobody ever endeavoured to scale the political walls without meeting with a great amount of abuse; but over and above this, you were subjected to coarse innuendoes and to insults, more or less disguised, because you were women. Well, that furnishes an argument of some weight in your favour. Men who can look with something like contempt upon every woman whose aspirations go beyond the care of a sick room are not the men to be entrusted with absolute control over you, and if you had a vote, not only their speeches but their minds would be greatly changed. ("Hear, hear," and applause.) Some persons have been irritated because, with one distinguished exception—I refer to the member for Halifax—no help was given to us by the members of the late Liberal Cabinet. Now I do not share in the least in that feeling of irritation. I look upon those men as friends in disguise. It is quite true they are not in favour of an honest household suffrage. They do not want impartial representation. They say they won't let you come in, but they are doing all in their power every session of Parliament to make it impossible to keep you out. They remind me of the man who, having determined that his fields should not be irrigated, not quite knowing what he was about, let loose the waters. They put you into the annual November elections. In complete oblivion of the spherical doctrine they invited you to contest the largest constituencies throughout the United Kingdom in order to become members of school boards. They are at the present moment assisting to establish grammar schools for you. They are willing to open to you the universities. They desire you to obtain medical diplomas. If these men think you fitted to deal with some of the most difficult problems to which the human mind can be applied, do you think it will be long before they will allow you to take part in the momentous duty of deciding which of two rather commonplace candidates shall go to the House of Commons? ("Hear, hear," and a laugh.) In conclusion, let me advise you to proceed on the old lines. Petition Parliament, hold public meetings, influence the newspaper press where you can, send deputations to explain your views to candidates, and, above all, excite as much as possible discussion. No matter who your opponents may be, however powerful, politically or socially, it

is much better they should attack you than that they should be silent, for a good cause not only lives, but thrives, on debate. Take to yourselves the well-known motto—"Without haste, without rest," and the end for which you have up to this time so gallantly struggled will inevitably come. (Applause.)

Mrs. OLIVER SCATCHERD (Leeds) moved the adoption of the report. She said the supporters of the movement had three special reasons for rejoicing on the present occasion. The first was the comparatively small majority of 35 by which Mr. Forsyth's Bill was thrown out in the House of Commons; the second was the character of the votes recorded in their favour, many of which were given by eminent men upon both sides of the House; and the third was the acknowledgment of the progress which their movement had made by the formation by leading politicians of an offensive association for preserving the integrity of the suffrage. It had always been their difficulty that they had not to contend with arguments, but with foolish sentiments. They had a right to expect when this association was formed that at least their reasons would be met with reasons, and that they would have something tangible to reply to. A week or two ago the great champion of the association addressed his constituents at Huddersfield. He pleaded eloquently for the extension of the franchise to the agricultural labourers, and then proceeded to censure women for applying to their own cause the arguments which he had himself used. Mr. Leatham's other remarks were totally unanswerable, not on account of their merit, but because women could not descend to his level of coarse personality and abuse. He systematically ignored the reasons which women set forth, and persistently refused to acknowledge the true ground upon which they demanded the franchise; and he hoped by poor sneers and paltry sentiment to carry his constituents along with him. She had received a few days ago letters from two of Mr. Leatham's constituents. One of Mr. Leatham's most devoted supporters said: "Our member is not, as a rule, given to sentiment, and why he should employ it whenever the women's suffrage is introduced we are at a loss to tell, unless it be that argument completely fails him." Another wrote: "Mr. Leatham is doing you good service; a few more such senseless, childish, and petulant tirades, and even I shall come round to your cause." As a woman she had appreciated and benefited by Mr. Leatham's remarks on many subjects. She had read his speeches with great pleasure, and admired the courage with which he had fought many a battle; but it was just because she deemed him so able and straightforward a politician that she regretted, on a subject of such vital importance, his remarks should be so entirely unworthy of the man. But his ridicule would not silence sensible unmarried women, and married women would refuse, and did refuse, to accept his insinuated compliments at the expense of their sisters. The speaker then proceeded to quote the orderly manner in which a six weeks' lock-out of 28,000 people in the Dewsbury valley had been conducted by a committee wholly composed of women, in order to show that working women were capable of managing public business, and added that in her frequent intercourse with these women she had found all of them eagerly desirous to obtain the franchise. She also expressed satisfaction at the fact that in some of the large northern towns the Liberal associations in the different wards had of their own accord adopted petition to Parliament in favour of woman suffrage.

Mr. CHARLEY, M.P., seconded the resolution. He said he had been connected with this movement from its commencement—long before he ever thought of enjoying a seat in Parliament. (Hear.) The Chairman (Mr. Jacob Bright) had referred to what he humorously termed the pedestal and

spherical arguments. There were some other arguments which might be referred to—the argument for example that if the suffrage were granted to women they must also be made eligible to become members of Parliament. Now, through the efforts of their chairman, female ratepayers had been enfranchised with regard to municipal elections, and although they were in the enjoyment of the municipal suffrage he had never heard yet of a female town councillor. The admission of women into Parliament would involve a complete *bouleversement* of existing order; and not the most extreme advocate of women's rights had ever made such a claim. Another argument which had been raised by Mr. Bouverie in the late Parliament was that there were half a million more women than men in this country, and if they had universal suffrage the female voters would swamp the male ones. But we had not universal suffrage in this country, and all that was proposed was that female ratepayers should be enfranchised, or, to put it in other words, that no person who was otherwise qualified for the enjoyment of the suffrage should be disqualified solely on the ground of sex. (Hear, hear.) Then there was the argument that it was contrary to maidenly or matronly modesty to go into the secret recesses of the polling booth, and unseen by human eye place a cross opposite the name of a candidate for parliamentary honours. He could not imagine that this would offend female modesty. The ground had been cut away from under the feet of those who used this argument by the adoption of the ballot, and yet Mr. Leatham, who was one of the foremost advocates of the ballot, was opposed to female suffrage. (Hear, hear.) He would tell them what offended female modesty. It was to be present in the ladies' gallery at debates such as that which occurred on the second reading of the Women's Suffrage Bill last session, and to have to listen to the coarse jokes of a Smollett, and the indecent inuendoes to which the chairman had referred. (Hear, hear.) When ladies availed themselves of the privileges of the House of Commons, by occupying the ladies' gallery, they ought to be respected by those who took part in the debates, and more restraint should be put on the language of the gentlemen who opposed this measure in Parliament. (Hear, hear.) The tone of the House of Commons would certainly be raised if women enjoyed the suffrage. Women, he thought, had a stronger grasp of great principles than men, and adhered to them with greater tenacity. He was sorry to say that there were many men who went to Parliament, not because they wished to promote the social and moral wellbeing of their fellow-subjects, not because they wished to elevate their common humanity, but simply because they looked upon a seat in Parliament as a necessary adjunct of their social position. There were a great many latitudinarians and platitudinarians and Gallios, and the number of those gentlemen would be greatly diminished if women had the suffrage, while the number of men of principle would be increased. Women were armed with a panoply which nature had denied to men. They had an intuitive instinct of what was right and wrong, which enabled them to penetrate through the flimsy disguises that imposed upon men, and if a candidate came to them with unctuous phrase and plausible speech, he thought they would examine his credentials more closely than a male voter would do, and would unmask him if he were undeserving of their support. (Applause.)

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

Mr. J. P. THOMASSON moved the election of the executive committee.

The Rev. J. FREESTON, in seconding the resolution, said that the way in which the business of that association had been carried on showed that ladies—at any rate many ladies—had great business habits. He denied that giving women the privilege to vote, which they would only be called upon to exercise

a few times in the course of their lives, would interfere in any way with their home duties, but he was inclined to think it would rather increase their sense of responsibility, and make them more likely to devote themselves more faithfully to their duties.

The resolution was adopted.

Miss BECKER moved a resolution of thanks to Mr. Forsyth and the other members of Parliament who had supported and voted in favour of the Women's Suffrage Bill in the last session of Parliament, and respectfully requested Mr. Forsyth and his coadjutors to take steps for the re-introduction of the Bill at an early period of the forthcoming session. She said that the chairman had referred to the attitude of the members of the late Government, and had called them friends in disguise. She only hoped they would very soon throw off their disguise, and come forth as open friends. They were all proud that their original champion had honoured them by occupying the chair that day, and they hoped that he might soon be restored to an arena where he could help them again as he did before.

Dr. PANKHURST seconded the resolution. He thought those who had been present at these gatherings from year to year must note a sensible difference in the character of the report, and in the tenor of the speeches. They more and more presented the features of a direct and determined agitation. They departed more and more from the ground of mere theory, and urged considerations and arguments which were always offered in the case of an agitation which was commanding public attention, and which presented indications of being an agitation which would ere long be accomplished in fact. In point of principle, he thought nothing could well be added to the admirable statement of the case by the chairman. We had recently had to consider in a great many respects the principles of our representative system. The two poles of that system were justice to all classes, supremacy to none. At this moment the second principle was most in the minds of thoughtful politicians, many of whom were afraid that one class might secure domination in the State, and reproduce in another and a bad form the old principle of class legislation. The simple maxim by which these two grand ends had been effected in the history of England and Europe was by giving to every class a place within the system of representation. Once in the representation, no class dominated. Therefore, on the ground of reason, of precedent, and of practice, there could be no reason against the claim of women to come within the limits of the suffrage, in order that they might on the one hand obtain justice to themselves and on the other co-operate in preventing any class from acquiring an undue and improper ascendancy. Every thoughtful politician must feel that with their admission to the franchise a new element of thought, intelligence, and responsibility would be added to the governmental system. There was one argument to which reference had been made, which in the minds of some earnest and sincere men formed a difficulty in granting the suffrage to women, namely, that woman's sphere was "the home." All men in modern Europe looked upon the home as the focus out of which moral and social virtue emerged, because it was there that the germs of moral life and the emotional sympathies were cultivated and developed. Their opponents said that women's suffrage would do harm to the home. His reply was that it would not only not do harm, but would do good—that it was a good thing for the home that this movement should accomplish itself in fact. It was a perfectly obvious thing to men in England that though public life was with us as disinterested as ever, it was not so devoted. It was a remarkable circumstance that in many constituencies at the recent elections there had been a difficulty in obtaining gentlemen who were willing to take the office of mayor. On

the other hand, with regard to home life, the competition of living grew more quick, active, and absorbing, so that the feelings and interests of home grew more intense and more selfish. We wanted to make the home life not less intense, but more disinterested, and public life not less disinterested, but more intense; and this could only be done by placing public and private life in such relations that the one should be the introduction and preparation for the other. To cultivate the virtues of the home life should be the school of discipline for public life and social duty. How better introduce the influence of public life into the family than by giving in every home a vote, the exercise of which would not be an absorbing thing because it would not be in the hands of married women, though he thought that that would be a good thing. Everybody would see that the duty of giving a vote caused people to have a direct interest in public affairs, and if they had an interest in public affairs it would enlarge the field of the mind's operation and introduce greater disinterestedness. He was therefore convinced that to give women a vote would put public life and the life of the home in such relations that they would be mutual aids to one another, that that which was weak in the one would derive strength from the other, and that they would mutually advance in works of beneficial and reciprocal action. It would add to public life a new strength and to home life a new virtue.

The resolution was unanimously carried.

The Rev. S. A. Steinthal having taken the chair, on the motion of Mrs. BUCKTON (Leeds), seconded by the Rev. W. A. O'CONNOR, a vote of thanks was passed to the Mayor for the use of his parlour, and another to Mr. Jacob Bright for presiding. The proceedings then terminated.

HUDDERSFIELD.

PUBLIC MEETING IN THE ARMOURY.

On November 23rd a crowded public meeting, in support of women's suffrage, was held in the Armoury, Ramsden Street. The chair was taken by his worship the Mayor (J. F. BRIGG, Esq., J.P.), with whom there were on the platform, Miss Becker, Miss Lilia Ashworth, Miss Beedy, M.A., Mrs. Oliver Scatcherd, Miss Sturge, (deputation from the National Society for Women's Suffrage) Edwd. Huth, Esq., J.P., Alfred Crowther, Esq., J.P., Aldermen T. Denham, J. Barrowclough, J. Woodhead, and A. Walker; Councillors W. Marriott, J. Eccles, and J. Glaisyer; in addition to many other ladies and gentlemen.

The following letter was received from Mr. J. C. Cox, who had been invited to the meeting, but too late to be read from the platform:—

"Chevin House, Belper.

"My dear Miss Becker,—I am very sorry that neither my health nor my engagements will allow me to be present at your meeting at Huddersfield to-morrow. I am always glad to do any little service I can for a cause so thoroughly equitable as that in which you are engaged, and I should have been especially pleased to have taken part in a woman suffrage meeting in a town that is represented in Parliament by so prominent an opponent as Mr. Leatham. The valuable aid that Mr. Leatham gives to other reform movements makes his attitude on this question all the more deplorable. I am jealous of the political reputation for consistency and clear-headedness that has usually been considered the characteristic of the Radical party, and I hope that the supporters of Mr. Leatham at Huddersfield will recollect in what a startling minority he is upon this question among advanced Liberals. If anyone was asked who were the most prominent and popular men of the Liberal party of the future, Sir Charles Dilke and Professor Fawcett in the metropolis, Mr. Chamberlain at Birmingham, Mr. Jacob Bright at Manchester,

and Mr. Cowen at Newcastle would certainly be the first mentioned, and all these gentlemen are heartily with us. The right of woman to the franchise is as certain to be granted as the right of the county householders, and it seems to me that both justice and reason are, or ought to be, louder in their demand for the former than the latter. I hope for the future our opponents, whether speaking in Parliament or out of it, will give us better arguments than sneers and offensive jokes. When will men learn that John Stuart Mill has lifted the subject immeasurably above all puny shafts of ridicule. I am sure that Huddersfield is too near to Dewsbury for the example of woman's capacity for business organisation to have been forgotten, as so strikingly exhibited in the late trade dispute.—Always yours, J. CHARLES COX."

The MAYOR, in opening the proceedings, said he was very much pleased with, and obliged to them for the kind reception they had accorded to him on his first appearance since his election as mayor. It was not to be supposed from his presence there that evening, and occupying the chair, that he was necessarily a supporter of the object which the ladies around him were there to promote. He might say that he owed something to the ladies for what they did on his behalf on the occasion of his re-election as a member of the town council, in voting for him and enabling him to stand at the head of the poll.

Mr. Alderman WOODHEAD moved the first resolution. In doing so, he remarked that he was scarcely in the neutral position claimed by their friend, the Mayor. He was there to express his hearty concurrence with the resolution, and, if he was not so much mistaken, before the meeting was over they would have a very large majority in favour of it. (Hear, hear.)

Councillor MARRIOTT seconded the resolution, remarking that he was just in the same position as Alderman Woodhead—he was in thorough sympathy with the movement, and for that reason he had great pleasure in seconding the motion.

Miss LILIAS ASHWORTH, who was very heartily received, supported the resolution, and in doing so said that since the meeting which was held in Huddersfield, on a similar occasion, little more than a year ago, the question of women's suffrage had been brought before Parliament, and the position which it had taken in the House during the last session showed them how great was the advance that had been made since that meeting. The position in the House of Commons was in some measure a reflection of the position of the question in the country, and she took it that this very large, remarkable, and representative meeting was an indication of the progress which the question had made in the enlightened town of Huddersfield. The question of political rights was a most difficult one for any person to engage in. It took working men years and years of labour before they got representation, and women knew right well that there was no royal road for them,—that they must take a leaf from the book of the working man, and that to gain political power they must work as he worked, and be prepared to make personal sacrifices even greater than he had made, in order to obtain some small share, it might be, of political rights in this country. The working men had to fight against some arguments, a good deal of prejudice, and a great many fears; and the women had to combat some few arguments, but they had to combat a great deal of prejudice, and fight against a great many fears. Political times had changed since men asked for the suffrage; therefore the fears which were expressed in regard to women were of a different class to the fears that were expressed in regard to the enfranchisement of the working men. Amongst certain sections of people, there appeared to be an honest dread that amongst women there was a mysterious, inherent, strange temperament which would make them, when they had the suffrage, all vote in one way. Some said they

would vote all in a revolutionary, others in a reactionary manner. Lately she met two Liberal members, both supporters of the Bill, of which each expressed to her his fears. One of them said, "I always vote for your Bill, because I believe it is just, but I very much fear the consequences to my party if it were carried." The Marquis of Hartington, at a Liberal banquet at Bristol, the other day, seemed to take a not very inspiring view of the prospects of his party, but he said that at the recent municipal elections there had been a considerable Liberal gain, and he, for one, welcomed any sign that the tide was about to turn again. She begged to remind the noble lord that for three successive years there had been a Liberal gain throughout the country at the municipal elections. Before the last Parliamentary election there was a municipal gain, and the Liberal newspapers congratulated the Liberal party on it, but what followed? They saw places that had returned a majority of Liberals and unsectarian candidates to their School Boards returning members of the Conservative party to represent them in Parliament. Now, when the newspaper press and Lord Hartington spoke of the municipal elections as a sign that the tide was about to turn in their favour they entirely overlooked the fact that in the municipal elections the electorate was not the same. Women voted quite as freely as men in the municipal and School Board elections, but in the Parliamentary elections men alone voted and were alone responsible for the great Conservative reaction. (Applause.) The Liberal party had sustained great and wide-spread defeat at the hands of the male electors, and they naturally looked with a good deal of distrust at what the female elector might do. If there was any comfort to be obtained from the municipal elections, it was that in those elections women's suffrage had been fairly on its trial, and they proved that the women voted neither in a revolutionary or reactionary manner, but that taken altogether their votes were given on the side of order and of progress. (Cheers.) The other member of Parliament to whom she referred said to her, "I always vote for your Bill, but I very much fear the power it will put into the hands of the clergy." This gentleman was one of the greatest upholders of chapel and Dissenting clergy she knew of in this country; his purse was ever open to their cry, but what he feared was the power of the clergy of the Established Church. She thought it was pretty generally understood that half the people of this country had dissented from the Established Church, and therefore she took it that the numbers of women would be pretty evenly divided between the Church and Dissent; and, therefore, when women were enfranchised, they would neither advance nor retard materially the disestablishment question. Men had placed a Conservative Government in power; it was men who had established and maintained that Church, and when they turned to poor womankind and accused them of being the upholders of the Church and Toryism, she was reminded of that Old Testament story where Adam tried to throw the blame upon Eve—(great laughter)—and she would reply to their accusers in the words of the New Testament—"First cast out the mote out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see more clearly to cast out the beam out of thy sister's eye." The hon. member for Huddersfield was not a supporter of that question, and he had made several speeches to justify the position he had taken upon it. She did not think it necessary to say very much about those speeches, because she believed they had been widely read, and that in such an enlightened constituency as this the emotional and historic incoherency of those utterances would have been duly weighed and appreciated. (Applause.) But she had read through his speeches in order to account for the extraordinary position which he had taken upon this question; and she thought she

had found one sentence which explained his vote, which she read. Last session of Parliament he said, "When an hon. member bases his vote upon the concurrent sentiment of both sexes, backed by the immemorial usages of the species, he need not be under very violent anxiety even if he permit his reason to repose." It had been very evident that in dealing with this question the hon. member had allowed his reason to repose, and when the reason was in that condition they knew that it was very difficult to go right and to make a speech about any question. Therefore, she for one, felt that great allowance should be made for the hon. member—(laughter)—and every sympathy should be extended to him in his trying position. But there was one apparently real objection which he had urged against this Bill, he said it was contrary to immemorial usage and the custom of mankind, and he took his stand by the Doxology—"as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be." (Great laughter.) In reply to this objection she urged that from time immemorial women had possessed some share of political power in this country. With the exception of some recent franchises, created in favour of male persons, there was nothing in their ancient law to prevent a freeholder or householder or other person merely by reason of sex from taking part in an election, if properly qualified. That women voted in the past was abundantly proved by writs now in existence signed by women as electors and returning officers, and the validity of which had never been questioned. It appeared that in the troubled times of the Stuarts votes to women had been refused by those who made the returns, and the question was brought before a court of law, and the judge used these words: "I see no disability in a woman from voting for a Parliament man." They found that it was the practice in the past, when Parliament granted a supply by way of direct taxes, to obtain the consent of persons both male and female, before obtaining the Royal assent; and when certain dues and subsidies had to be granted by the Commons, the consent was then obtained of the lords temporal and of the ladies temporal, and their concurrence in the grant was made part of the statute. Thus they found that women not only took part in the election of "Parliament men," but their consent was also required before imposing taxes upon them, therefore in the demand they were making for the right to elect the men who taxed them, and legislated for them, they were walking strictly upon the lines of the British constitution—(cheers)—for they were supported in their demand by the "immemorial custom" of mankind, and by the ancient usage of their country. They were told that in giving women political power they were creating a precedent for which in history there was not one single precedent; and they reply that some of the most remarkable monarchs in the East as well as in the West had been Queens, and history recorded how women had governed as well as reigned, and left their mark on the history of their country by the excellent use they made of political power. (Cheers.) Mr. Leatham, in speaking of our Queen, asked "Is the Queen a politician? Is she a partisan? or has she to choose between rival policies?" She found in a speech made by Mr. Bright, in 1866, on electoral reform, the following observations with reference to the Queen: "The noble and illustrious lady who sits upon the throne—she whose gentle hand wields the sceptre over the wide empire of which we are the heart and the centre, she was not afraid of the Franchise Bill which the Government introduced last Session. Seven times, I think, by her own lips, or by her pen, she recommended to Parliament the admission of a large number of working men to the Parliamentary franchise. If this proposition was destructive, would not the Queen discover that fact?" If the Queen were not afraid to make so great an innovation upon the immemorial custom of mankind as to admit to political

power—some people said to the largest share of political power—the working men of this country, she did not see why Mr. Leatham and other timid persons—(laughter)—should be so much afraid of admitting to some small share of that political power the female subjects of the same Queen. (Applause.) They were told that the franchise ought not to be given to women because they were in a position of dependence, and that they ought not to enfranchise dependent, but independent electors. That argument might have some weight in the House of Commons, where gentlemen were accustomed to think and speak of women as if all women were in the same class as the ladies they met with in society, but it could have no weight whatever in the country where women toiled and worked for themselves and their families. (Cheers.) In the census returns they found that there were between ten and eleven millions of women in England and Wales, and above a third of these were working for themselves and their families—were in fact the bread winners, and oftentimes she had no doubt were to be found supporting the male elector of the family. (Cheers.) That proportion was not diminishing, but increasing, from year to year, and legislation had dealt with the interests of those toiling women. It was interfering with their labour, telling them how long they shall work; it was taking their children to school, and interfering in a hundred ways with their homes, and these women were feeling that unless they could send members to represent them their interests would not be sufficiently guarded and cared for by the Legislature. It might be asked what they expected would help them to bring about the settlement of that question, and she did not think she could find a better reply than one afforded her by the hon. member for Huddersfield himself. In a speech he made at Huddersfield—early last year—speaking about the then Liberal prospects, he said, "Ten years ago household suffrage and the ballot were not practical questions, but what made them practical?—the way in which unpractical men talked about them. Did they think these questions settled themselves? No. These questions were settled by unpractical people talking about them in the most unpractical manner possible, jumping up in the House of Commons in the most irresponsible and disgusting manner possible, as Mr. Disraeli said. This was the way in which these questions were settled, and they were going to settle some more questions in the same way." (Cheers.) It appeared to her as if their question was not going to be an exception to this rule; it was going to be settled by unpractical people talking about it in the most unpractical manner possible, proving to everybody but themselves how unpractical they were. (Laughter.) Its settlement had been, and it would be continued to be, hastened by Mr. Leatham, Mr. Smollett, and a number of other members of Parliament jumping up in the House of Commons in the most irresponsible manner possible—(laughter)—and giving vent to utterances of which, if not already, they would hereafter be most heartily ashamed. (Applause.) She would remind him that

— Wherever wrong is done,
To the humblest and the weakest 'neath the all-beholding sun,
That wrong is also done to us; and they are slaves most base,
Whose love of right is for themselves and not for all their race.

In this controversy they had reason and justice backed by immemorial usage of our country, while on the side of their opponents there were sentiment and sneers, ridicule and revilation. What mattered it? They had the consolation of knowing that all unwittingly they were helping forward the cause of freedom, and that they were both working towards the same end. (Cheers.)

Mrs. OLIVER SCATCHELD, in supporting the resolution, said they were there to consider a grave subject, one which had occupied the attention of their leading politicians during the last

fifty years—she referred to the efforts which had been made from time to time by various classes in this country to secure for themselves direct and efficient representation in the House of Commons. Time was when the great merchants, bankers, and manufacturers of these northern towns were unrepresented, and doubtless there were those amongst them who fought hard for the Reform Bill of 1832. If so they could tell how fierce was the battle which was then fought; how bitter was the opposition which those in power gave; what wild words were said; what reckless prophecies were indulged in. We were now living in that future, and they had seen the results of that great victory. Instead of the wrong which was predicted what did they see? The great development of internal order, peace, and prosperity. We had progressed, sometimes rapidly and sometimes slowly, and she thought we were perfectly right in auguring that the same great blessings would flow from the Reform Bill of 1867 by which the artisans of that large town were enfranchised. At every struggle for increased representation the party in power had always shown an undefined dread—a great fear of extending the franchise to those who stood without the political pale—and it was just that dread—that undefined fear—which they women had now to combat. They knew that their cause was moderate and just, and their work was to convince others that it was so. Year by year they found public opinion ripening in their favour, and their opponents found year by year their arguments slipping from them, until they were compelled to refer to the experience of all that “which is sanctioned by revelation” in support of their position. Mr. Leatham, as they knew, was the great champion of the opposition association which was formed recently by leading politicians to their society, and she thought they had a perfect right to expect from that association that their reasons would be met by reasons. They had been disappointed in that. She thought that on many points the electors of Huddersfield have every reason to be proud of their member—(applause)—he had taken a part in many a good battle, and done good service to the Liberal cause of this country—(applause)—but upon this one question he seemed to her indeed utterly feeble and irrational. As soon as women's suffrage was mentioned, reason went out, and was supplanted by petulant anger. She would only refer to one of his remarks, that in which he referred to unmarried women being the most unrepresentative of their sex. Consider for one moment what it was that they were asking. They were asking not for any social equality, but for legal equality, and she maintained that unmarried women were the only legal representatives of their sex. In the eyes of the law a married woman had no separate existence—no individual existence; she could not enter into any contract with an employer, or anyone else; she was deemed to be utterly incapable of managing any money affairs, her very children were not considered her own; she was regarded as a perpetual infant in the eyes of the law—as someone always to be looked after and taken care of; but the law did in a certain measure grant an acknowledged existence to unmarried women, and therefore she said that in this light, in the eyes of the law, the unmarried women were the only representatives of their sex. The only argument against women's suffrage which really deserved attention was that the majority of women did not want it. To that she replied, “That is no reason why the minority, which does want it, should not have it.” That minority, however, was an increasing one, and by no means adequately represented in the House of Commons by the number of signatures which were attached to petitions. Those women who did not wish for the franchise could follow the example of many men and not exercise it when they had got it. (Laughter and cheers.) This argument that women did not

want the franchise, and was better without it, was made in the same spirit as that used by the slaveholders to justify slavery; but they did not think that the slave's ignorance of his degradation was any reason for keeping him in it—(cheers)—and her own experience was that many married women would like to help in this work if their husbands were willing that they should do so. Only last week, as she came from Manchester, she was speaking to two gentlemen about this point, and one of them said, “Oh, I should have no objection at all to my wife coming out in this matter if I thought she would cut a good figure.” (Laughter.) Another gentleman, seated by him, remarked, “Oh, that's just it; I should rather like to see my wife on the School Board, but it's getting there.” (Laughter.) He said she would have to appear at the ward meetings, but he should be on tenter hooks all the time. So they saw it was here not that the men were opposed to their cause, but that their personal vanity would be wounded. (Laughter.) Did all husbands, she asked, cut a good figure upon public occasions? (Laughter.) Did wives never sit on tenter hooks while their husbands were going round seeking, perhaps, to be elected as town councillors? There had been other objections urged against the measure, and one that Mr. Jacob Bright very aptly termed the pedestal argument had been given up, having been violently exploded by the wife beaters of Lancashire and Yorkshire. There was one—the spheric argument, which was answered by three reasons. First, that there were nearly a million more women than men in this kingdom; secondly, that nearly four millions of women in this country earned their own living; and thirdly, that those women who had spheres to repose in were not always content to remain exactly within the limits of those spheres. (Applause.) Sir Henry James, speaking at Taunton the other evening, used very earnest, cogent, and, to her mind, very conclusive reasons against the Flogging Bill being made law, and said it depended upon the feeling of the people whether it became law or not; but she should like to know what he meant by the feeling of the people. Evidently he meant that men only were to be consulted about it, and the very women for whose alleged benefit this retrogressive measure was introduced never had their opinion consulted about it. She had had some experience among working women in two or three of the large manufacturing towns, and she knew that they did not want it to become law. They knew that the tendency of such a Bill would be to subject them to more of that brutal treatment to which many of them were so unfortunately subject already. Many of them dared not give evidence in courts of justice against their oppressors, and she thought that Sir Henry James would speak with power and force in the House against that measure if he were backed up by women constituents. There was no quick remedy for a long, deep-rooted evil. The law had so systematically taught men to regard women as their inferiors, that there was no wonder that amongst the least educated portion of society sometimes the superiority of man showed itself in this brutal manner. What women wanted was not more protection but power to help themselves. (Hear, hear.) Take any woman who was wishful to do some good—say in such towns as Leeds, Bradford, or Huddersfield—she went out and came face to face first of all with that great question of pauperism. She struggled earnestly to raise women above the level of the beggar, and all to no purpose, for the law stepped in, over which she had no power; her heart was touched by the great evil of intoxication—and she knew good women who were willing to lay down their lives to redeem their sisters from this great evil—in season and out of season they devoted their time to it, but all to no purpose, for at the same time a so-called Liberal Government brought in a measure which gave

fatal facilities to women for drinking, and in a great many instances had created a taste for it. (Hear, hear, and applause.) Members of Parliament very often asked them to look at Miss Florence Nightingale and one or two of her friends, and imitate them; but why did they not tell the agricultural labourers to look at Mr. Forster, or Mr. John Bright, and imitate them. Genius would, under most circumstances, raise itself and make itself known, but she had yet to learn that genius was spread broadcast more among men than it was among women. She would remark that Miss Florence Nightingale, Miss Octavia Hill, Miss Cobbe, and Miss Carpenter all want the Women's Suffrage Bill—(applause)—but the Bill was intended for the average women of all classes. There was a very strong tendency on the part of those in power to legislate for those who had no power, and to illustrate this she asked them to regard the various restrictive measures which had been passed upon women's labour by the last two Parliaments. There were some who were anxious to place all women's labour under such control that women would never be able to sell their labour as they would like, nor take it where they liked, but the men knew that they would not consent to be so restricted for one week, and it was impossible to place the restriction upon all women. She could not sit down without referring to a very remarkable occurrence which took place not far from Huddersfield in the spring of this year. Many of the audience might know that there was a lockout in the district of Dewsbury; it lasted six weeks, and during that time there were 26,000 or 28,000 people thrown out of work. They all knew what that meant. Now, the whole of the negotiations of those thousands of people were carried on by a committee composed entirely of working women. (Applause.) It was her privilege to be with the Executive Committee during the whole of that time, and she was happy to say many times since, and whilst she was prepared for great shrewdness and common sense among them, she was not prepared to find working women of great administrative capacity, showing great power of organisation, calling large public meetings, two or three of them addressing those public meetings with great facility—the president with the rare tact of ruling stormy public meetings; but she found all this, and she knew that it was not a question with the women of getting all they could. They earnestly strove to see all sides of the question, and to consider the master's interests as well as their own. During the whole of that lockout there was not a single case of ill conduct reported. It must be remembered that the people had but a meal a day, and that a poor one, and that, she thought, spoke volumes; it showed at any rate that if no other class in the community were ready, the working women had given signal proof of their capacity to manage their own affairs, and she found that all these women agreed to work for the suffrage for women. (Loud cheers.)

The resolution, on being put to the meeting, was carried, with a few dissentients.

Alderman WALKER proposed a resolution adopting a petition to Parliament, and memorials to the borough and county members.

Councillor GLAISYER seconded the resolution, stating that it would have been a greater pleasure for him to do so if the words, “requesting Mr. Leatham to support it,” had been omitted. With regard to the question itself, he entered the room as a scholar, though his own views were that ladies, otherwise entitled to vote, ought not to be disqualified, unless some more valid reason could be shown than had yet been advanced. (Hear, hear.)

Miss BEEDY, M.A., in supporting the resolution, said that there was no one familiar with the actual state of the law, but would say that there were many laws which were unjust to

women; and there were none who considered the matter, who would not say that when the interest of men and women were opposite, the interests of the men (as was only natural, they being the legislators), would be attended to whilst those of the women were frequently overlooked. Mr. Gladstone, referring to that question, once said that the law did not much less than an injustice to women, and that in consequence they suffered great hardships, and that any man who could devise a plan by which that injustice could be set right must be considered as a great benefactor. It seemed to her that the exercise of the Parliamentary franchise on the part of women would tend to remove that injustice. She maintained that, if entrusted with the franchise, the women would use proper discrimination in carrying it into effect, pointing to the municipal and School Board elections in support.

Miss BECKER said, that after the enthusiastic meeting held a year ago, they would not have thought it necessary to come to Huddersfield again, were it not for the circumstance that, although she believed the people were earnestly in favour of their view of the question, they sent to Parliament as a representative, a gentleman, who, unfortunately for them, deemed it his duty to oppose their wishes and opinions on that point. And not simply did he oppose the Bill, but he took a very active part in the opposition, and was a member of an association formed by a number of members of Parliament for the purpose of opposing the Women's Rights Question. Here a radical member found himself in somewhat unwonted company; for, along with two or three more Liberals, he was in company with Conservatives like Mr. Bentinck, Mr. Beresford Hope, Mr. Chaplin, Mr. Raikes, and Mr. Newdegate—(laughter)—all of them banded together for the purpose of maintaining the integrity of the franchise, in opposition to the claims of the extension of the Parliamentary suffrage to women. Mr. Leatham had opposed the Bill in terms of such abuse, as those Conservatives in whose company he found himself had not condescended to; but they would ask him to set aside the abuse, and substitute arguments. She maintained that many women possessed greater political capacity than some men, as was proved in India by comparing the States governed by the men to those under the dominion of women. There was one remarkable thing in the borough, and that was that they had a very small proportion of women electors. From the Parliamentary returns it appeared that in 1871 there were 11,029 men and 1,023 women. That was to say the female municipal electors in Huddersfield were one in every twelve throughout the constituency. The Parliamentary electors were almost the same, the householders being 11,129, and lodgers two, making a total of 11,131. Therefore they had not household suffrage in Huddersfield, for they had 12,000 houses represented in the municipal elections, whilst there were only 11,000 represented in the Parliamentary. Mr. Leatham, she noticed, was elected by a majority of about 600 over his opponent at the last election, and as there were 1,000 houses in the borough disfranchised, it was evident that Huddersfield was not properly represented, because if it had been there would have been those 1,000 votes extra, by which either Mr. Leatham's opponent might have been returned, or Mr. Leatham might have doubled his majority. Mr. Leatham presented a petition to Parliament, in favour of the Bill, from Huddersfield on the morning of the debate, signed by 6,000 persons, which, reckoning the population as 80,000, was about one in twelve of the whole constituency. Now they were about to ask them to sign a petition, and prove to Mr. Leatham that a real and strong majority of that meeting wanted him to support it.

After a speech from Miss STURGE, the CHAIRMAN was about to put the resolution, when Mr. S. B. TAIT said he begged to

propose as an amendment that the clause in the resolution asking Mr. Leatham to support the Bill be omitted. His reason for doing so was that Mr. Leatham's constituents knew he had convictions on this subject, and it seemed, to say the least of it, bad taste to ask him to support the Bill.—Mr. E. HUTH: No, no.—Mr. TAIT said the supporters of that movement would be glad to get Mr. Leatham to their side, but the way to get him over was not by using a sort of mild intimidation.—There was no seconder, and the original resolution was passed.

Alderman DENHAM moved, and Mr. E. HUTH, J.P., seconded a vote of thanks to the speakers, and the first named gentleman said he thought it would be utterly impossible for Mr. Leatham to answer the arguments which had been advanced that evening.—The resolution was passed.

Mrs. SCATCHERD, in reply, moved, and Miss ASHWORTH seconded, a vote of thanks to the chairman, and the Mayor having replied, the meeting concluded.

A day or two after the meeting, Mr. Leatham was at the opening of a new Liberal club at Huddersfield. After a vote of thanks for his attendance, Mr. LEATHAM, in reply, said: Ladies and gentlemen,—I feel deeply grateful to you for the honour which you have done me in passing this vote of thanks, and I accept it as a renewed evidence of your unabated confidence in your representative. (Cheers.) I must also thank my good friends who have just spoken, for the kindness with which they have been pleased to refer to my humble services. With them I venture to express a hope also that nothing will occur to shake the confidence of my constituents in me, which, I may say, is the pride of my life. I don't think that it was much shaken by anything which the ladies said in the Armory the other night. (Laughter.) They don't appear to have shaken my friend the Mayor, or my friend Alderman Barrowclough, both of whom were present, and took part in the meeting. (A Voice: "Splendid meeting," and laughter.) Well, the fact of its being a friendly meeting (the hon. member caught the word splendid wrong, and several voices called out "splendid" again, but the hon. member did not notice the change) rather embarrassed him in the remarks which he might make in reference to it. This morning, when I saw the report of the meeting for the first time in the *Huddersfield Examiner*, I regretted to find that two of the most important speeches had been omitted. I suppose my friend Mr. Woodhead was reserving them as a *bon bouche* for to-day. Now, when I glanced at the proceedings, I felt a good deal of embarrassment as to what was the course which I ought to pursue with reference to them. Here were five young ladies, who had come all the way from Manchester—and goodness knows where—in order, with the greatest kindness, to explain to you that your representative is "feeble and irrational." (Laughter.) Well, now, I thought, it will be hardly respectful to those ladies, now that I have the opportunity, if I did not come down at once and admit that this is a true bill—(laughter)—or if I should venture to doubt it, the question occurred whether I was bound to tackle all these five ladies at once—(laughter)—including Miss Beedy, Master of Arts, and Miss Lydia Becker, who, as you all know, is the great apostle of petticoats. (Renewed laughter.) Well, then, I remembered I had already selected a subject upon which to speak to my friends this evening, which appears to me to be a great deal more important and a great deal more practical than the possible enfranchisement here and there of a few spinsters and widows. But I look once more at the speeches. Now, considering the very spirited start that these young ladies made I felt very much amazed to find that, after all, not one of those arguments upon which we have been accustomed to rely in dealing with this question had been so much as touched by one of them. There was nothing, for

example, with reference to the argument which may be drawn from what I believe to be the ineffaceable distinction between the sexes, and their spheres of duty and responsibility, except that the Queen is a woman, and the extract from Mr. Bright. Now, Miss Liliash Ashworth, I think, omitted to mention that Mr. Bright is an emphatic opponent of that measure. No one knows better than Mr. Bright that the Queen is no politician; that she rules solely by the advice of her ministers, who, as I once ventured to remind the House of Commons, are still men, and not women. Well, then, we had nothing with reference to the absurdity of advocating women's suffrage, and yet excluding from your agitation the enfranchisement of married women, the absurdity, I say, of advocating female suffrage as a right, and excluding from its exercise all those women who have entered upon the discharge of the most serious responsibilities of the sex. Nor had we anything, so far as I remember, with reference to what I ventured to call the immemorial usage of mankind as regards male voters—except the assertion that sometime in the most obscure and disorderly periods of our history one or two women may have voted. Nor was there anything with reference to revelation, except a sneer at it. Now, I propose to say no more whatever about this subject to-night, because I am desirous, as far as possible, of leaving to those ladies that luxury which every woman not only in the United Kingdom, but in the globe, accounts to be more delicious than any other, and that is the privilege of saying the last word. (Loud cheers.)

The following article appeared in the *Huddersfield Examiner*:

The meeting held in the Armory, last night, to promote the objects of the Women's Suffrage Association, was one of the largest and most influential meetings ever held in Huddersfield. There was a fair representation of all classes; the speaking was of the highest order; and the interest was fully sustained to the close. From beginning to end, there was nothing with which the most fastidious could find fault, while the admirable reasoning, the powerful eloquence, and the incisive wit of the lady speakers carried the vast audience thoroughly along with them, and the resolutions were passed almost unanimously. Of course, Mr. Leatham, M.P., came in for a good deal of attention, and his more recent speeches on the Women's Suffrage question were freely but fairly criticised. The vigour and acuteness manifested in the answers to Mr. Leatham's arguments and sarcasms were much relished, and whether they may have the effect of converting the hon. member for Huddersfield to the views of the association or not, they will undoubtedly compel his respect, as the utterances of opponents fully able to enter the lists and hold their own against himself and the other members of Parliament who have formally banded themselves together to resist the Women's Suffrage movement.

An exceedingly strong, and as it appeared to us, an unanswerable, case was made out by the various speakers, and as we listened to the sound principles and high-toned political morality which pervaded every speech, we felt what an important educational influence such meetings must necessarily exert, and that to admit women to the possession of the Parliamentary franchise would largely benefit both sexes. Women would be stronger, and while men would not be weaker, they must become more refined. Mothers would be able to train their sons more intelligently for the discharge of public duties, and while mere party contests might be less factious and bitter, political controversy would be more intelligent, more earnest, and more patriotic than it has usually been in the past. Believing this, whatever might be the immediate effect to the Liberal party of the admission of women householders to the exercise of the Parliamentary franchise, we wish success to the movement, and congratulate its friends upon the satisfactory meeting held in Huddersfield last night.

MODERN LOVE SONG.

(By a Young Bachelor in the Black Country.)

Come, live with me, and be my bride,
And when the nuptial knot is tied,
Our wedding-day I'll make you rue,
And nightly beat you black and blue.

My temper's ugly, as you'll find,
I'm brutal when with rage I'm blind:
I work as little as I can,
And drink my wages like a man.

There's working men as spend their lives
In slaving to support their wives:
With such as them I don't agree;
I want my wife to work for me.

Ere half our honeymoon be flown,
You'll hardly call your life your own:
And when a second month hath sped,
You'll wish you'd died ere you had wed.

Assaulted by my manly foot,
Encased in heavy hob-nailed boot,
A life of misery you'll lead,
And all in vain for mercy plead.

Some day, when I am on the drink,
Of death I'll beat you to the brink:
And if the neighbours interfere,
I'll swear you tried to stop my beer.

Then, should you snivel to the beak,
Mayhap he'll quod me for a week;
But when I darken next your door,
You'll catch it hotter than before.

So, if you like that sort of "hub,"
Would see your savings spent in "bub,"
And daily tremble for your life,
Come, live with me, and be my wife!—*Punch.*

Miss Craigen held meetings on Oct. 6, in the Friar Hall, Exeter, Mr. Rex in the chair. On Oct. 25, in the Mechanics' Institute, LOOE, Mr. J. S. Hicks in the chair. On Nov. 12, in Mount Zion Methodist Chapel, MOUSEHOLE, Cornwall, Mr. John Ash in the chair.

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY COMMITTEE.

Secretary: Mrs. Wolstenholme Elmy, Congleton, Cheshire.
Treasurer: Mrs. Jacob Bright, Alderley Edge, Manchester.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS RECEIVED DURING

NOVEMBER, 1875.		£	s.	d.
Samuel Courtauld, Esq.	...	10	0	0
Miss Jessie Boucherett	...	5	0	0
George Dixon, Esq., M.P.	...	5	0	0
James Cropper, Esq.	...	2	2	0
Mrs. Mills Baker	...	2	0	0
J. Hinde Palmer, Esq., Q.C.	...	1	1	0
Miss Price	...	1	0	0
Mrs. de Hersant	...	1	0	0
Miss Catherine Gertrude Lloyd	...	0	10	0
Miss Whitworth	...	0	10	0
Thos. Taylor, Esq., late Treasurer of the London Committee	...	7	1	8
sends the Balance of his Account, viz.	...	£35	4	8

URSULA M. BRIGHT, Treasurer.

N.B.—Forms of petition in favour of Mr. Russell Gurney and Mr. Shaw Lefevre's Bill, with leaflets and all information, to be obtained from the Secretary, Mrs. Wolstenholme Elmy, Congleton, Cheshire.

BRISTOL AND WEST OF ENGLAND SOCIETY.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS FOR NOVEMBER, 1875.

	£	s.	d.
Miss Williams	5	5	0
Miss Tribe	1	1	0
The Viscount Amberley	1	0	0
Mr. R. Cory, junr.	1	0	0
Mrs. F. Smith	1	0	0
Mr. Mark Whitwill	1	0	0
Mr. W. Tribe	1	0	0
Lady Bowring	0	10	6
Mrs. Beddoe	0	10	0
Mr. J. Buckley	0	10	0
Mr. F. Gilmore Barnett	0	10	0
Mr. C. Hancock	0	10	0
Mrs. Higginson	0	10	0
Mrs. Olive	0	10	0
Mrs. Peck	0	10	0
The Misses Southall	0	10	0
Mr. Alfred Price	0	10	0
Mr. S. Home	0	7	6
Mrs. P. Suhle	0	7	0
Mrs. Atkinson	0	5	0
Miss E. Brock	0	5	0
Miss Budden	0	5	0
Mr. Dakyns	0	5	0
Mr. T. Gath	0	5	0
Rev. W. Hargraves	0	5	0
Mr. J. L. Daniell	0	5	0
Rev. B. Hartnell	0	5	0
Miss Higginson	0	5	0
Mr. Hamilton	0	5	0
Mrs. Hamilton	0	5	0
Miss Fitzherbert	0	5	0
Mr. Jacques	0	5	0
Mrs. Jacques	0	5	0
Mr. G. H. Leonard	1	1	0
Miss Lloyd	0	5	0
Mr. Albert Pole	0	5	0
Mr. C. T. Tait	0	10	0
Miss Taylor	0	5	0
Miss Leedham	0	5	0
Mr. J. F. Norris	0	5	0
Mrs. J. F. Norris	0	5	0
Mr. Rogers	0	5	0
Mrs. Stone	0	3	0
Mr. G. Bessell	0	2	6
Mrs. W. Sturge	0	2	6
Mr. J. Chapman	0	2	6
Mr. S. Clarke	0	2	6
Miss Dance	0	2	6
Mrs. E. F. Grenfell	0	2	6
Mrs. Hunt	0	2	6
Miss Le Geyt	0	2	0
Mrs. Thorpe	0	2	0

£24 11 6

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

STALYBRIDGE.

A meeting was held on November 25th, in the Town Hall, Stalybridge, under the presidency of the Mayor. Miss Beedy and Miss Becker attended as a deputation, and the usual resolutions were moved and seconded by the Rev. Mr. Everitt, Alderman Baker, Councillor Hlingworth, and Councillor Dunlop, and passed with one dissentient. Votes of thanks concluded the proceedings.

INFANT MORTALITY.—We are not in the habit of writing in commendation of Patent Medicines generally, but as a safe remedy for difficult teething, convulsions, flatulency, and affections of the bowels is frequently required, we earnestly call the attention of Mothers to Atkinson and Barker's Royal Infants' Preservative. Unlike those pernicious stupefactive which tend to weaken and prevent the growth of children, this Preservative gradually improves the health and strengthens the constitution, and from its simplicity, in no case can it do harm, indeed it may be given with safety immediately after birth. For nearly a century this real Preservative of Infants' Life has been recognised throughout the world as the best Medicine for all disorders of Infants, and is sold by Chemists everywhere, in 1s. 1½d. Bottles of the same quality as supplied to Queen Victoria for the Royal Children.—[Advrt.]

MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS RECEIVED DURING NOVEMBER, 1875.

	£	s	d.
Mr. J. Hinde Palmer	1	1	0
Mr. J. B. Whitehead	1	0	0
Mr. Geo. Blacker	0	2	6
Mrs. M'Iqham	0	2	6
BURNLEY (continued).			
Dr. and Mrs. Spencer Hall	0	10	0
Dr. Dean	0	10	0
Mr. Ralph Holden	0	10	0
Mr. Peter Fletcher	0	10	0
Mr. R. J. Hurtley	0	10	0
Mr. Joseph Graham	0	10	0
Mr. John Baron	0	10	0
Mr. J. Berry	0	10	0
Mr. John Taylor	0	7	6
Mr. Thos. Shepley	0	5	0
Mrs. Leather	0	5	0
Mr. Wm. Baldwin	0	5	0
Mr. Thos. Sager	0	5	0
Mr. Henry Nutter	0	5	0
Mr. Francis Hartley	0	5	0
Dr. O'Sullivan	0	5	0
Miss Cronkshaw	0	5	0
Mr. Bracewell	0	2	6
Mr. John Bradley	0	2	6
Mr. J. Kippax	0	2	6
Mr. Thos. Carr	0	2	6
Mr. Bolton	0	2	6
Mr. Samuel Taylor	0	2	6
Mr. John Williams	0	2	6
Mr. Henry Allen	0	2	6
Mr. Ed. Crawshaw	0	2	6
Mr. J. C. Smith	0	2	6
Smaller sums	0	5	6
Mr. Measham	1	1	0
Mrs. Wm. Smith (Huddersfield)	1	1	0
Mrs. Gwynne	1	1	0
Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Bart., M.P.	1	0	0
Miss Theodosia Marshall	0	10	0
Mrs. Leaf	0	10	0
Mr. F. Hardcastle	0	5	0
Mrs. Woodhead (Manchester)	0	5	0
Mr. H. Woodhead	0	5	0
Miss Lucy Woodhead	0	5	0
Mr. J. B. Martin	0	5	0
Mr. J. Gilbert	0	5	0
Rev. Brooke Lambert	0	5	0
Miss Porter	0	5	0
Mrs. Barber	0	2	6
Mr. Henry Harris	0	2	6
Mr. B. Mellor	0	2	6
Mrs. Wayham	0	2	6
Miss Woods Hughes	0	2	6
RIPON.			
Mrs. Smallpage	0	10	0
Mrs. Baynes	0	10	0
Mrs. Alfred Smith	0	5	0
Mr. John Severs	0	5	0
Mrs. J. B. Lea	0	5	0
Mrs. G. Severs	0	5	0
Mrs. Gatenby	0	5	0
Mrs. Heal	0	5	0
Mrs. Ebdell	0	2	6
Mrs. R. Horner	0	2	6
Mrs. Severs	0	2	6
Mrs. Snow	0	2	0
Mrs. Thompson	0	2	0
Mrs. Hebden	0	1	0
Mrs. Walker	0	1	0
THIRSK.			
Mr. B. Smith	0	5	0
Mr. John Rhoades	0	5	0
Mrs. W. Ayre	0	5	0
Mr. Geo. Ayre	0	2	6
Mrs. Geo. Ayre	0	2	6
Mr. J. W. Hall	0	2	6
Mrs. J. W. Hall	0	2	6
Mr. Jacques	0	2	6
NORTHALLERTON.			
Mr. Joseph Braim	0	10	6
Mr. W. A. Hutchence	0	5	0
Carried forward	23	8	6

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS (continued).

	£	s	d.
Brought forward	23	8	6
Mr. R. M. Middleton	0	5	0
Mr. James Guthrie	0	5	0
Mr. H. T. Akers	0	5	0
Mrs. Ayre	0	5	0
Mrs. J. Awde	0	5	0
Mr. J. Stainsby	0	5	0
Rev. R. Crookall	0	2	6
Mr. Geo. Dowson	0	2	6
Mr. T. Ayre	0	2	6
Mr. G. F. Clarkson	0	2	6
Mrs. Fairburn	0	2	6
Mr. Joseph Fairburn	0	2	6
Mr. C. Hodgson	0	2	6
Mrs. A. Guthrie	0	2	6
Mr. Cooper	0	2	0
MIDDLESBOROUGH (continued).			
Mr. J. Jennings	0	10	6
Mr. Wm. Taylor	0	10	6
Mr. C. E. Muller	0	10	0
Mr. J. S. Calcot	0	2	6

£27 9 0

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 The Limes, Nelson-street, Chorlton-on-Medlock; or to the Secretary, Miss BECKER, 28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

Contributions to the funds of the Central Committee of the National Society for Women's Suffrage, 64, Berners Street, London, W., from October 21st to November 20th, 1875.

	£	s	d.
Household Suffrage	100	0	0
Impartial Representation	100	0	0
Mrs. Hargreaves	5	0	0
Mrs. Thomas Taylor	5	0	0
Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Crook	2	2	0
Mrs. Leon	2	2	0
Mrs. Paulton	2	0	0
Mr. Percy Bunting	1	1	0
Mrs. Hullah	1	1	0
Mr. Frank P. Leon	1	1	0
Mr. Howell Willis	1	1	0
Miss Dixon (Seaton Carew)	0	10	0
Mrs. Elmslie	0	5	0
Mr. and Mrs. Lucraft	0	3	0
Mrs. Barry	0	2	6
Miss Carey	0	1	0
A Friend	0	1	0
BUCKINGHAM.			
Mr. Holland	0	10	0
Mr. Ellis	0	5	0
Miss Handcombe	0	5	0
Mrs. Ridgway	0	5	0
A Widow	0	5	6
Mr. Nelson	0	2	0
A Friend	0	2	0
Mr. Howe	0	1	0
Mr. Salmon	0	1	6
WELLINGFORD.			
Mrs. Hawkins	0	10	0
Mr. R. Deacon	0	5	0
Mr. Mitchell Marshall	0	5	0
Mr. Morty	0	5	0
Mr. W. Payne	0	5	0
Mr. Upton	0	2	6
Dr. Marshall	0	2	0
Dr. Barrett	0	2	0
Mr. Saunders	0	1	0

£225 8 0

ALFRED W. BENNETT, Treasurer.

WEST MIDDLESEX BRANCH.—In the list of subscriptions given last month, a contribution of £2. 2s. 0d. from Mrs. Geo. Sims was accidentally omitted. The total amount received should have been stated as £24. 19s. 6d.