

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

VOL. VI.—NO. 61. PUBLISHED MONTHLY.
REGISTERED FOR TRANSMISSION ABROAD.

MARCH 1, 1875.

PRICE 1d.—BY POST 1½d.

Mr. FORSYTH has taken time by the forelock in introducing the Women's Disabilities Removal Bill, and in obtaining an early date and a most favourable period for the second reading. The Bill was read a first time on Monday, February 8th, and the second reading is fixed for Wednesday, April 7th. This is about three weeks earlier than the time when the debate has usually come on; but seeing that during the whole of last session the Bill stood on the Order Book without being discussed, we are sure that all our friends will rejoice in the prospect of speedily arriving at the long-looked-for debate and division. There is no possibility that the circumstances which prevented the debate last year can occur again. Owing to the short and exceptional character of last session, and to the competition among members who had Bills to introduce, Mr. FORSYTH was unable to secure a free Wednesday, and had perforce to content himself with a day when other motions stood before him. But the Bill stands now as the first order of the day on the first Wednesday after the termination of the Easter recess, and nothing can possibly be set down to come before it, or to postpone the debate.

The Easter holidays will probably begin about March 22nd, and in order that petitions may have their due effect, it is highly desirable that they should be sent in time to be printed in the last report which will be issued before the recess. We, therefore, earnestly exhort our friends to send as many as they possibly can before March 17th, and afterwards to go on petitioning up to the very day of the division. Petitions sent during the recess will accumulate, and be in readiness to be presented on the re-assembling of the House, which will probably be on or before April 5th. These petitions will do very great service, although they should not be included in the Report which will be in the hands of honourable members at the time of the discussion on the Bill. They will appear daily in the columns of the *Times*, and they will help to swell the number of members whose attention will be called to the question by the duty of presenting them.

The meetings which have taken place in the month

have been numerous and influential. During the first week in February meetings were held at various towns in Sussex and Kent, which were well attended, for the most part by persons to whom the question appeared to have never before been fairly presented. At all these meetings resolutions affirming the principle of the Society, and adopting petitions and memorials in support of Mr. FORSYTH'S Bill, were accepted by majorities more or less decisive; and in every case the second resolution was passed by an increased majority. It was felt by the deputation who represented the Society at these meetings, first, that the audience needed to be instructed and convinced; next, that they were so instructed, and that they adopted the resolutions, not as a foregone conclusion, but as the result of the arguments presented to them. The second week was occupied with meetings in the dense population of the Midland Counties. Here the people seemed to have made up their minds beforehand. The simple fact that household suffrage is the basis of representation in this country had settled the question of the right of women householders to the franchise. The deputations met audiences already prepared to admit the justice of the claim, and their speeches seemed almost to be a work of super-erogation. But the meetings served to spread and confirm sound principles and better knowledge of the subject, and the experience of the different manner in which it is received in small and large towns, or in different districts of the country, is extremely valuable in showing the thorough concurrence and unhesitating support which is accorded to the principle in all the great centres of population and of social and political activity. The heart and the mind of the people are with us, and we have every confidence in commending our cause to the consideration of Her Majesty's Government and to the sense of justice of the Legislature.

THE first list of public Bills for the present session contains several having special reference to or concern for women, or which directly or indirectly affect the question of their representation in the Legislature. Taking them in the order of time, the first is one which has been

already disposed of for this session. The second reading of the Deceased Wife's Sister Marriage Bill was rejected on February 17, by 171 votes to 142, being a majority of 29. Mr. ARTHUR MILLS, in moving its rejection, alluded to the fact that women, who were so deeply interested in questions touching domestic interests and family ties, were unrepresented in the Legislature. We trust that all members who take an active part either in promoting or opposing Sir THOMAS CHAMBERS'S Bill will see the justice of admitting women to a share of representation before calling on the House to sanction so serious an alteration of the marriage law, and in uniting to support Mr. FORSYTH'S Bill, which would give women a voice in determining his and other questions affecting them.

The next in order is Mr. COWPER-TEMPLE'S Bill to remove doubts as to the legal powers of Universities in Scotland to admit women to the privileges of education and of degrees. The second reading is fixed for Wednesday next, March 3rd, and it is not for us to attempt to forecast its fate, further than to express our conviction that no Bill which concerns the interests of an unrepresented class is likely to succeed when opposed, as this Bill is opposed, by a powerful and interested section of the represented class.

The Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill is set down for the same day. As women have not the municipal franchise in the sister island, it would seem that any proposal to amend the law affecting it should offer a favourable opportunity for placing Irishwomen on an equality with Englishwomen in this respect. We believe the Irish members are animated by a generous and chivalrous sense of the deserts of their countrywomen, and we have confidence in commending this matter to their consideration.

Mr. CHARLEY'S Offences against the Person Bill, set down for April 14th, chiefly concerns the protection of helpless children under fourteen years of age, from worse evils than over long working hours in factories.

On May 12th the House will be asked to amend the Representation of the People Act, with a view to admitting to the suffrage, servants, domestic or otherwise, who do not pay rent for their houses in money. We trust that by the previous division on Mr. FORSYTH'S Bill the House of Commons will have shown itself not less careful of the political rights of the mistresses of landed estates, of shops and factories, of farms and households, than Sir DRUMMOND WOLFF asks it to be of those of their coachmen and footmen, their grooms, gardeners, and labourers.

Very nearly the same considerations will apply to the

Household Franchise Counties Bill, which stands for second reading on July 7th. Mr. TREVELYAN proposes to give the vote to an overwhelming number of men, consisting admittedly of the least intelligent and least educated members of the community. Their claim is that they suffer, that they feel their own grievances, and know their own wants better than others know and feel for them, and that their sufferings would be more likely to be ameliorated if they were represented in the House of Commons. These considerations, joined to their instinctive faith in the principle of popular suffrage, outweigh in the minds of almost all professed Liberals the possible dangers of the admission of so large a proportion of the uneducated classes to the franchise. We desire to impress on Liberals who support the County Franchise Bill that both on the grounds of just principle and practical grievances, the claim of women householders is at least as strong as that of agricultural labourers, and that if they would commend the principles they profess to the sympathies of their countrywomen, they would do well to act on these principles when the interests of women are at stake.

AMONG the measures proposed for the amendment of the law, no place is found at present for any Bill dealing with the property and personal rights of married women. The English law on this subject has been stigmatised by Lord COLERIDGE as more worthy of a barbarian than of a Christian country, and some cases which have appeared in the courts during the past month show the futility of the clumsy attempts which have been made of late years to amend it. The first is that of a married woman, deserted by her husband, who became entitled to a legacy of £100. The Married Women's Property Act of 1870 declares that when any woman married after the passing of the Act shall become entitled to any sum of money not exceeding £200, under any deed or will, such property shall belong to the woman for her separate use, and that any married woman may apply to the Bank of England that any sum forming part of the public stocks or funds to which she is entitled may be transferred to the name of the woman as a married woman entitled to her separate use. Here was a case which seemed exactly to fit the provisions of the Act. Mrs. LENTON was married in 1872, and the sum which was left to her was under £200, and was invested in the public funds. Yet the Bank of England refused to transfer the stock to her name without the consent of the husband who had deserted her,

and the Master of the Rolls upheld them in the refusal. The Act, therefore, appears to be a dead letter in the very cases where it is most needed.

The next case was that of a wife who applied for a summons against her husband, who had threatened to take her by force from the custody of her friends. She stated that she went in bodily fear. The summons was refused on the ground that the husband was entitled to use force. It is to be hoped that this decision will not become too widely known, especially in Lancashire.

In the Dublin Court of Queen's Bench a return was made to a writ of *habeas corpus* granted at the instance of a man against his wife, to compel her to produce their four children, a boy and three girls. She alleged that he was not fit to have the charge of them, but the Court held that the father's legal right to the custody of the children (except as to the eldest boy, who was of age to decide for himself) was incontestable. The boy decided to remain with his mother. Then Mrs. LENNON exclaimed in a piteous voice, "Oh, my Lord, show mercy to me and my children." The little girls cried loudly, and clung to her, saying, "Mother, don't leave us." The Lord Chief Justice expressed the opinion that this was just the case which the Act of 1873 was intended to meet. But if so, it failed in its intentions, for the father stepped forward to take the children forcibly away, and the Lord Chief Justice withdrew, leaving them to their fate.

The last case is not so tragic, although the question involved is serious enough. At the Blackburn Petty Sessions, a married woman, a weaver, was summoned for leaving her work without notice. The defence was that a married woman was not capable of making a contract of this nature, and therefore not liable to penal consequences. The magistrates rejected this defence, and awarded damages and costs, but granted a case for a superior court. Should the decision of the magistrates be upheld, a great step in the right direction will have been made in establishing the legal right of a married woman to make a contract, and her liability to be sued for a breach of it. But if, as seems to us more probable, the judgment should be reversed, the necessity for an amendment of the law will be forced on the consideration of the public, in consequence of the vast numbers of married women employed in the textile manufactures of the country.

AMONG the utterances recently given forth on the question of the franchise for women, few are more worthy of atten-

tion than the able and statesmanlike speech of Miss TOD, at the Annual Meeting of the North of Ireland Branch of the Society. We desire that the grave and thoughtful view of the question presented therein may be contrasted with the superficial notions expressed by the right honourable member for Liskeard, in reply to a question from one of his constituents. Mr. HORSMAN appears to be in the counsels of "Nature," for he declares positively that "It" intended that woman should be "the blessed assuager of care and grief," etc., etc., etc. We presume that this means the care and grief of men. But we would ask the right honourable gentleman, if women have no cares or grief of their own, and whether they are bound to limit their efforts to soothing the cares and smoothing the paths of men? Miss TOD could inform him of the difficulties of the constantly-increasing class of women thrown on their own resources for a livelihood, of the "perpetual encroachments of legislation on the domain of women, of the grievous ways in which women suffer, there being no rank nor class, no age nor relationship, no possible condition of life in which there are not many women suffering in life, or limb, or liberty, or education, or in property," in consequence of the operation of the law. Who is to be the "blessed assuager" of the agony of the mother, whose children are torn from her arms in the name of the law; of the penury inflicted by the confiscation of property in marriage, and by the legislative restrictions on the industrial freedom of women? Charity begins at home, it is said, and there are not wanting noble and self-devoted women who are penetrated with sympathy for the sufferings of their unfortunate sisters, but these "find themselves crippled in their warfare with the folly, the selfishness, and the apathy which hinder all kinds of useful work," and foster all kinds of social misery "by the want of the distinct position and tangible power which the possession of the franchise confers."

Mr. HORSMAN and many others who are ruled by what they call their "feelings" on this question, appear to consider that the only part of men's interests in which women ought to have a share is their sufferings or their sins. Woman is to be the "calmer of passions," the "softener of strife;" when the occupations of man have made him coarse, it is the function of woman to bring him back, to soften and refine him. It does not appear to enter into the mind of such reasoners that women may have a share in man's joys as well as his sorrows, in his virtues as well as in his failings, in his daily life as well as in his exceptional moments. Even Mr. HORSMAN would scarcely main-

tain that men are so perpetually needing to have their griefs assuaged, their passions calmed, their strife softened, and their coarseness refined, as to keep women continually employed in these pleasing offices. Surely women may be allowed a little variety, for even if they are, as Mr. HORSMAN says they are, angels sent from heaven expressly for this purpose, they might in the long run find the task too weary and monotonous for the angelic nature.

It is mockery of the cruelest kind to answer a demand of women based on human needs by a refusal grounded on the allegation that they are "angels." Women are not angels, but human beings. Angels are supposed neither to hunger nor thirst, neither to toil nor to spin, neither to marry nor to be given in marriage. Women partake all these human cares and duties, and have equal interest and equal right with men, to concern themselves with the legislation which regulates these conditions, and with the general welfare of society. Mr. HORSMAN says women are, or ought to be, out of the sphere of politics. We reply with Miss TOD that "women are citizens of the State—inheritors with men of all the history which ennoble a nation, guardians with men of all the best life of the nation, bound as much as men are bound to consider the good of the whole, and justified as much as men are justified in sharing the good of the whole."

PARLIAMENTARY INTELLIGENCE.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

No. 2.] 8th February, 1875. 33

277. Women's Disabilities Removal Bill,—“to remove the Electoral Disabilities of Women,” presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 7th April, and to be printed. [Bill 25.]

THE FOLLOWING IS THE TEXT OF THE BILL:—

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

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

Notice of opposition to the Bill has been given by Mr. E. A. Leatham, M.P., for Huddersfield.

THE RIGHT HON. E. HORSMAN ON WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

At a meeting of his constituents, at Liskeard, Mr. Horsman was asked by Mr. Scantlebury his opinion on women's suffrage. Mr. Horsman said he had seen no reason for changing his opinions on the women's suffrage question since he voted upon it in the House of Commons; and he would state very briefly the views that he held. He thought that women were out of the sphere, or ought to be, of politics. He thought so, because admitting them was contrary to the design of nature. Nature intended that man should be employed in the active business of life, in its strifes, its turmoils, its contests, and its passions. It intended that woman should be the calmer of passions, that she should be the softener of strife, and that she should be the blessed assuager of care and grief. The occupations of man of necessity made him coarse. It was the function of the woman to bring him back, to soften him, and to refine him. Nature had cast men and women in different moulds, and gave to each different degrees of strength adapted to their different occupations, and, in his opinion, the more a woman unsexed herself, and the more she ceased to be feminine and aspired to become masculine, the more she departed from that character of purity and refinement which had caused not only poets to say that women were angels, but had also made men of business say that the woman in the form of a wife, a mother, a sister, or a child, had been an angel sent from heaven to bless and comfort him in his trials. That was not the only reason why he would not allow the attributes of woman to be stained and polluted with the grosser passions of men. He was opposed to women's suffrage, not because he thought women were not high enough for the suffrage, but because it was too low for them.

STRIKE OF WOMEN WEAVERS AT DEWSBURY.

The strike and lock-out of the woollen operatives is now in full operation in the Dewsbury and Batley district, and 25,000 workmen and workwomen are out of employment, while all the mills in the heavy woollen district, with one or two exceptions, are standing still. The dispute arose out of the action taken by the masters in reference to the payment of weavers. The "plain-loom" weavers have hitherto been much less remuneratively paid than the "box-loom" weavers, consequently, difficulty was frequently found in obtaining sufficient hands to work the former. In order to remedy this, the masters decided on a uniform scale of prices throughout the district. The weaving is done by women, and they without delay intimated their dissatisfaction with the change. The great majority found that the result of the alteration would be a material diminution of their wages, and they determined to strike against it. The masters, finding the weavers obdurate, decided on a general lock-out. The first meeting of the operatives was held at Spinkwell, Dewsbury, on February 15th, when the number present was estimated at 10,000,—the majority of whom were women. Mrs. Wood was voted to the chair, and several men and women operatives addressed the meeting. Next day, another meeting was held in the same place, again presided over by Mrs. Wood. There were some 5,000 or 6,000 present, principally women, with a large proportion of girls. One of the women said they had been threatened with being "clammed" to death if they did not yield to the masters, but if they did yield they would be equally "clammed" to death; and for her part, if she had to suffer it, she would as soon be "clammed" to death idle as working. ("Hear, hear, and laughter.")

PUBLIC MEETINGS.

NORTH OF IRELAND BRANCH OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

On February 8th, the third annual meeting of this association was held in the Ulster Minor Hall, and was largely attended.

On the motion of Dr. MACCORMAC, seconded by the Rev. JOSEPH MACKENZIE, the chair was taken amid applause by the Mayor (Mr. Thomas G. Lindsay).

The CHAIRMAN said: We have, during the past fifty years, been giving the franchise to Dissenters, Roman Catholics, and Jews; labourers, coal porters, gardeners, and coachmen, but yet refuse it to our mothers or sisters, no matter how exalted by station or intelligence. We are told, forsooth, by some that this is not a question for woman to take part in the discussion of. More shame for the other sex that, by their apathy or something worse, that has compelled their action. If women had had the franchise, the legislation of the country would speedily have less of brutality, drunkenness, and other evils hardly to be mentioned. In England a woman may rule over the greatest empire on the globe, but may not vote for a member of Parliament for the borough of Windsor. She may proclaim war or make peace, she may appoint a Lord Lieutenant for Ireland, she may appoint a Lord Chancellor of England, but she must have no vote for a member of the Lower House. In Belfast a woman may vote for a Harbour or Water Board Commissioner, but not for an Alderman or a Town Councillor. Make up your mind to succeed, and your success is a mere question of time. (Applause.)

Miss Tod then read the annual report, which, after referring to the general position of the question, and to the death of Canon Kingsley, called attention to "the anomalous position of women with regard to the local franchises of the three kingdoms. In England qualified women vote at all local elections of every kind. In Scotland they possess the right of voting for various purposes, the most important of which is for members of School Boards; but they do not vote for Town Councils. In Ireland they vote for Poor-law Guardians and for Harbour and Water Board Commissioners, and in towns which are not incorporated they vote for Town Commissioners; but they are excluded from voting for Town Councils. No one has attempted to defend these capricious arrangements. Your committee, however, prefer to confine their efforts to obtaining the Parliamentary vote, believing that others will necessarily follow."

The adoption of the report was moved by the Rev. HENRY OSBORNE, of Holywood, seconded by Miss STURGE, and carried unanimously. Mr. JOHN GREENHILL moved a resolution affirming the principle of the Society.

Miss Tod said: That meeting was at first arranged to be held ten days earlier, and if it had then taken place they would have been favoured with the presence of several members of Parliament, including both the borough members, the member for Carrickfergus, the member for Dungannon, and one of the members for Down. The letter of Mr. Johnston was as follows:—

"Ballykilbeg, County Down, 2nd February, 1875.
"My Dear Miss Tod,—I greatly regret that, in consequence of the Parliamentary session calling me to London, I am unable to be present at the meeting in Belfast in favour of women's suffrage.

"By restricting the claim made to the right of women holding property which would entitle them to the franchise but for their sex, I think it is scarcely possible so just a demand can long be denied by Parliament.

"Exercising the municipal franchise in Great Britain, it seems strange that women should be denied the Parliamentary one, which is similar in qualification.

"In Ireland, where, for some unexplained reason, the municipal franchise is much higher than the Parliamentary, the question is a little complicated.

"I trust your meeting will be very successful.—Believe me to be, faithfully yours,
"WM. JOHNSTON."

Miss Tod then proceeded to second the resolution. She said: One would think that by this time the object of the Women's Suffrage Bill and Women's Suffrage Societies would be well understood—namely, that we seek to obtain the vote solely for all duly qualified women; and the qualification for women being exactly the same as that for men, only such women could vote as own or occupy property in their own rights and in their own names. But even if one or two of our numbers held further views, such as might not be approved of, why should a just claim be refused lest an unjust one should be presented? And it would be both easier and nobler to refuse the wrong claim after the right one had been granted. We believe that there is some danger of a social *emeute*, the more serious because it has no recognised outlets, in consequence of the perpetual encroachment of legislation upon the domain of women, without any corresponding enlargement of women's means of letting their views, as well as their interests, be known. Now, the way to change revolution into reform is to begin in time, to examine carefully where the sources of discontent be, what causes them, and why they are felt more now than they ever were before; and then to apply such a remedy as the case requires. In a country with free institutions, representation is the remedy which suits all such cases; because the full and fair statement of the interest of all classes which representation secures is the necessary condition of the redress of all grievances. It is curious to see how women are driven to use the same phrase, "redress of grievances," when they plead for admission into the circle of the Constitution, which men were driven to use when the commonalty was first pleading for admission, in the days when the great charters of our liberty were obtained. Every great reform, every genuine reform, has two aspects. The one which attracts attention first in all cases is its outward aspect, the evils which exist, and which it is hoped this will cure; the sins both of omission and commission which persons of more eager kindness than others look for a remedy for, and will not rest satisfied till they have found one. But such of these philanthropists as are philosophers also soon pass beyond this. They look for the causes of the evils they see, and they search for such a remedy as will reduce or lessen them, and their effects through them. If the same remedy approves itself to the thoughtful statesman and to the far-seeing philosopher as to the ardent and practical philanthropist, it is a strong presumption that we have hit upon the right thing, even although there are many of all these classes who do not yet approve of it. And it makes the presumption almost a certainty if we see that, whenever any person seriously investigates the evils complained of, especially in connection with each other, he is sure, sooner or later, to announce his approbation of the proposed remedy. Now, this is exactly the position which the claim of qualified women to the suffrage occupies. Almost every person, I believe, who has appeared as its advocate was led to see its importance by becoming awake to some one or more of the grievous ways in which women suffer. There is no rank or class, no age, no relationship, no possible condition of life in which there are not many women suffering, in life, limb, or liberty, in education or in property. Among those of the highest ranks such injuries are rarest, for obvious reasons; in the lowest they are most grievously common, and

they are utterly devoid of the means of reaching the legislators. And, yet it was said of a lady of rank that the then Lord Chancellor of England spoke, thirty years ago, when he said that the laws of England regarding women were so hopelessly bad that he dare not attempt to put a finger to reform them. "There is no use in doing anything," said he; "women are sacrifices from the cradle to the grave." But that is not our view of such a question. We have reason for devout thankfulness that in these days a more wholesome tone prevails. Good men and women insist upon knowing the worst of things, simply that they may remain the worst no longer. Very horrible things are now brought out into daylight, but they are a thousand times less dangerous there than in the darkness. Consequently, among the many philanthropic efforts going on just now, those to help or protect women in various circumstances hold a conspicuous place. Some of these are fully accepted by the public at large as being right and reasonable; some commend themselves chiefly to those whom sad experience has taught the necessity of the case; and some are only struggling for recognition against many prejudices. But sooner or later they all lead to the suffrage, and, curiously enough, it is not only because where legislation touches women's interests, the voice of women should be heard, but also because even merely social reforms need the pressure of voting power behind the arguments or persuasions used, in order to render them effectual. The greater part of those who are working for these reforms have found this out already. (Applause.) It is a common trick of those who oppose any such movement as ours to find fault with each step proposed, and say "If it had only been something else, if it had only been something more practical, we could go with you." For instance, the other day I read an elaborate article, written to soften people's horror at the practice of vivisection, and saying if those who lately memorialised the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals about it would only direct their attention to the cruelties practised on animals killed for food, or for dress, or for ornament, that it would be a much more useful effort. The writer forgot, or perhaps he did not choose to remember, that the same persons and the same societies which protest against the cruelties of sciences protested long and strenuously against the cruelties of commerce. In the same way we are often told, "Oh! if you would try to do something to improve the defective education of women, or to open up employment to underpaid women—or if you would try to stop the frightful brutalities inflicted upon them—that would be worth doing far better than this fancy about the franchise." They forget, first, that the people who are working for the franchise are the very same as those who are working for these other things, though indeed education is a sufficiently popular subject to have other adherents also. But of the other subjects—new employments for women, and proper practical training for these employments, and trying to stop the many evils inflicted upon poor women—I might almost say that the suffrage advocates have a monopoly of these very anxious and arduous pieces of work. But, in the next place, it is the difficulties of this practical work, arising either directly from law or indirectly from customs suggested and sanctioned by law, which have induced these ladies to become assertors of the claims of women to the franchise. Lately I read in a popular journal an article about women's work, in which a description was given of Miss Rye's emigration scheme; of Mrs. Senior's admirable report on the state of the schools for pauper girls, and suggestions for the improvement of their position; of Miss Nightingale and Miss Merryweather's work in training nurses; of Miss Octavia Hill's astonishing labours in improving the dwellings of the poor in the worst parts of

London, winding up with the usual formula that ladies who were anxious to do good ought to follow these examples, and give up the agitation for the franchise. Now, every one of these ladies is an advocate of the franchise, and, more than that, every one of them was made such by her work, finding herself crippled in her warfare with the folly, the selfishness, the apathy, which hinder all kinds of useful work, by the want of the distinct position and tangible power which the possession of the franchise confers. The appeal to be practical, therefore, just comes to this—that women who suffer need the franchise for protection, and women who work for others need the franchise for efficiency. Perhaps the former of these considerations attracts the attention of men most, and the latter the attention of women. If there are men cynical enough to say with Browning's Court Guide,

—Man has the brawny arm
And ball of fist, woman the beardless cheek,
And proper place to suffer in the ride,
Then let man rule—

there are others who think such reasoning from mere physical strength as fallacious as that of the crocodile who gives forth his views of creation in this week's *Punch*. Indeed, there are some men who feel more strongly even than we do the coarseness and the injustice of many of the laws affecting women's interests. One of the most popular and most intellectual noblemen of the North of Ireland said to me the other day that he had not paid much attention to the question of women's suffrage till lately, when the recent frightful outbreak of brutality towards wives, and women in general, in some parts of England, led him to consider what might be the causes, and what the remedy, and he came to the conclusion that the suffrage must be given as part of the remedy. His train of reasoning ran thus: These brutal outrages are not confined to one district, or one occupation; the only thing constantly noticed is, that they occur chiefly when wages are high. That, of course, means that drink is the proximate cause. But why should the excitement and passion of drink take this particular form? The reason for that must be that the men of these classes have an habitual contempt for the women of these classes—a conviction which the society in which they move has taught them that women deserve no consideration; and consequently when maddened by drink an assault upon a woman seems a venial thing. Neither the humanity of women, nor their citizenship, is acknowledged by a large proportion of uneducated men. For the first, indeed, there is no cure but the influence of religion; it is the awakening to see the equal relationship of all God's rational creatures to their Creator which alone can teach them true and unflinching respect for each other. But for the second, the country can teach them that women are citizens of the State—inheritors with men of all the history which ennoble a nation; guardians with men of all the best life of the nation; bound as much as men are bound to consider the good of the whole; and justified as much as men are justified in sharing the good of the whole. The first and most tangible mode of doing this is by giving the right of voting to all duly qualified women. It has much value in itself, as has been shown already, but it has perhaps even more as a symbol. It may be that the result of women's suffrage would be that a man who beat his wife would be more severely punished than now; but certainly it would be that he would be much less likely to give full swing to his passion if this tangible sign of social status belonged to some of the women about him. But while so many good men feel thus strongly moved by the sufferings of poor women, and are led by them to adopt this claim, ladies, women of the influential classes, are led to it by the difficulties in the way of their work.

Besides those already named Miss Carpenter's reformatory work, Miss Martineau's efforts to teach thrift and industry, Mrs. Grey's systematic aim at higher education, and a score of other similar movements have led to the same result in making untiring workers advocates of women's suffrage. (Applause.) This conviction would be all but universal if people's power of imagining, and therefore entering into and sympathising with, the sufferings of others was greater than it is. Thus every improvement in other things, every increase of culture, every advance in religious and moral feeling, will increase the number of those good women who wish to obtain at once the most necessary and the most powerful instrument of usefulness which society in this country possesses. It is a truth that people fight more earnestly for duties than for rights; the fact, therefore, that so many educated men and women are fighting, not for themselves, but for others, in asking for the suffrage, is a good omen of success. (Applause.) One of the most thoughtful writers of the last generation says: "The duty of preserving the liberty which our ancestors, through God's blessing, won, established, and handed down to us, is no less imperative than any commandment in the second table, if it be not the concentration of the whole." This man proved that moral responsibility and freedom of action are always and in all things co-extensive. It is these considerations which make women desire the suffrage; and if it be true, as I suppose it is, that there is much that is ugly and wrong in the mere management of party politics, how are they ever to be purified and Christianised except by the introduction of persons whose reasons for touching politics are of a higher kind? Has not general society become much better and purer now than it was in the last century; and is not the change generally ascribed chiefly to the mingling of ladies with gentlemen in all forms of social intercourse? We have very good reason to hope that politics will be equally improved by the influence of women. But, after all, the mere outward form of this change is not alarming. Last Thursday many ladies in Belfast voted in the election of Harbour Commissioners. They walked in and out of the harbour office without the least discomfort, and you have heard from Miss Sturge that in the School Board election at Birmingham, a constituency numbering as many thousands as the Harbour Board constituency does hundreds, voting was perfectly easy, and unaccompanied with disagreeable circumstances. (Applause.)

The resolution was adopted. Mr. ROBERT HAMILTON then moved that a petition be presented to the House of Commons, signed by the chairman on behalf of that meeting. Mr. JOHN H. NEILL seconded the resolution, which was adopted. Mr. John Greenhill having been called to the chair,

A vote of thanks was, on the motion of Dr. WILBERFORCE ARNOLD, seconded by Mr. JOHN COATES (Secretary to the County Antrim Grand Jury), passed amid applause to the Mayor for his kindness in presiding. The proceedings then concluded.—*Abridged from the Northern Whig.*

DOWNPATRICK.

On February 9th, a meeting was held in Downpatrick, Mr. Boyd, J.P., in the chair. Miss Tod and Miss Sturge attended as a deputation, and Mr. Edward Gardner, Mr. Davis, J.P., the Rev. G. C. Nelson, and the Rev. M. Donnell were the local speakers. The usual resolutions were adopted, and the meeting separated.

ENNISKILLEN.

A largely-attended meeting was held in the Town Hall, Enniskillen, on February 12. The Rev. A. Maclatchy occupied the chair. Miss Tod, Belfast, proposed the first resolution,

in favour of women's suffrage. Miss Sturge, Birmingham, Member of the School Board, seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously. The second resolution was moved by Mr. J. Jordan, T.C., who said that his attention was first called to these matters when attending the meeting of the British Association in Belfast, when he heard Mrs. Grey, Miss Tod, and other ladies speaking on Education; and complimented Miss Sturge on the "gay wisdom" of her address, to use Mr. Disraeli's phrase about Sir Wilfrid Lawson. The motion was seconded by Mr. T. Plunket, T.C., in a very cordial speech and passed unanimously. A vote of thanks to the Chairman closed the proceedings.—*Abridged from the Impartial Reporter.*

LEWES.

MEETING AT THE COUNTY HALL.

On February 1st a well-attended meeting took place in the Assembly-room of the County Hall, Lewes, in furtherance of the objects of the National Society for Women's Suffrage, from which Miss Becker and Miss Beedy, M.A., attended as a deputation. The chair was taken by the HIGH CONSTABLE of the Borough (Robert Crosskey, Esq.), and on the platform were T. J. Monk, Esq., and the Rev. F. Woolley, B.A. Those present in the body of the room included Mrs. and Miss Whitfield, R. Hillman, Esq., and the Misses Hillman, I. Gell, Esq., and Miss Gell, Mrs. and Miss Baxter, Wynne E. Baxter, Esq., Rev. A. P. Perfect, Rev. W. E. Richardson, Rev. A. J. and Mrs. Parsons, Rev. H. C. and Mrs. Cole, Rev. G. A. M. Little, J. C. Lucas, Esq., C. R. Kemp, Esq., and Mrs. Kemp, E. Armitage, Esq., Colonel Mackay, A. Elmsley, Esq., M. S. Blaker, Esq., Capt. Helby, J. G. Braden, Esq., A. Browning, Esq., and Mrs. Browning, H. Jones, Esq., Capt. Chatfield (1st Sussex Volunteer Artillery), Lieut. Fraser (R.S.A.M.), Rev. — Bulmer, Mr. and Mrs. J. Hoather, Mr. and Mrs. R. Brown, and Messrs. Joseph Shelley (junior Constable of Lewes), J. Bushby, C. Parsons, — Blaker, jun., Martin, G. Green, Every, Arkcoll, Hunsley, H. Wingham, &c. The first resolution was moved by the Rev. G. A. M. LITTLE, seconded by C. R. KEMP, Esq., and supported by Miss BEEDY. On being put to the meeting it was declared to be carried. The adoption of a petition and memorials was moved by the Rev. W. E. RICHARDSON, seconded by Mr. EVERY, and supported by Miss BECKER. The CHAIRMAN said he held in his hands a letter from Mr. Christie, M.P., who regretted that a previous engagement prevented him attending. He expressed his general concurrence with the measure, and his willingness to support it if the majority of the spinsters and widows were in favour of it. (Cheers and laughter.) After some remarks by Mr. A. H. BROWNING, the motion was put and carried by a much larger majority than the previous one. T. J. MONK, Esq., then proposed a vote of thanks to the two ladies, remarking that he had known very little about the question till to-night, but now he was much impressed as to the justice of the claim of women to the franchise. ROBT. HILLMAN, Esq., having seconded, and the motion being carried with applause, a vote of thanks was passed to the Chairman, and the meeting broke up.

CANTERBURY.

A public meeting in connection with this question was held at the Music Hall, Canterbury, on February 2. The chair was occupied by T. N. Wightwick, Esq., and amongst those present were—Captain Lambert, Colonel Cox, Major Burridge, Mr. A. Fielding, Mr. J. Reid, Mr. Hemery, Mr. J. Brent, Captain Winter, Mr. G. Beer, Captain Collard, Mr. Mudford, Dr. Pittock, Captain Swiney, Mr. W. N. Wightwick, Mr. Hugman, Mr. Ashenden, Mr. Elgar, Mr. Elwin, Capt. Graves, Mr. Keyes, &c., &c. Several ladies occupied the front benches,

and the body of the hall was well filled. Miss Becker and Miss Beedy, M.A., attended as a deputation from the National Society for Women's Suffrage.

The Chairman then read letters from Sir Windham Knatchbull, Bart., M.P., the Bishop of Dover, the Bishop of Dunedin, and the Dean of Canterbury, all expressing with certain reservations qualified approval of the movement. The letter from the Dean of Canterbury was as follows:—

Deanery, Canterbury,
February 2nd, 1875.

Madam,—While I see many objections to married women exercising the franchise, I am decidedly in favour of those women who at present vote at municipal elections, having the right also to vote at elections for members of Parliament. As they pay rates and taxes, they should also have the right to vote at the election of those who have to defend their interests, and as they are used to exercise an independent judgment, I do not doubt but that they would exercise the franchise quite as well as many who enjoy the right now.

I have the honour to be, Madam,
Yours very obediently,
R. PAYNE-SMITH.

Miss M. E. Beedy.

The resolutions were moved and supported by Mr. ALLEN FIELDING, Mr. JOHN ELGER, and by the deputation, and carried unanimously.

In supporting the adoption of a petition Miss BECKER said that she should not forget that their movement owed a debt to Canterbury, for here was the home of one whom they were proud to reckon as one of the fathers of their movement, of one to whom she was proud to allude as her literary and political sponsor. She alluded to Dean Alford. (Applause.) Dean Alford was a member of the first committee that was formed in this country for extending the Parliamentary suffrage to women, and it was he who introduced her to the literary and political world by admitting a paper to the pages of the *Contemporary Review*, of which he was the editor. A man like Dean Alford would not have adopted this movement lightly, or if it were a trivial thing; but he saw that this was necessary to enable women to bear their part in the world.

Votes of thanks concluded the proceedings.

ROCHESTER.

A large and influential meeting was held in the New Corn Exchange, Rochester, on February 3rd, when resolutions in support of Mr. Forsyth's Bill to remove the electoral disabilities of women were almost unanimously agreed to. Dr. Knighton was in the chair; and Miss Becker, of the Manchester School Board, and Miss Beedy, M.A., delivered eloquent and forcible addresses in favour of the objects of the meeting. The local speakers were the Rev. T. Arthur, the Rev. R. Maclellan, Miss Young, Mr. Aveling, Mr. Belsey, and Mr. Lambert. A working men's political society, which had passed a resolution adopting the principle, were represented on the platform by one of their number as a deputation. Votes of thanks concluded the proceedings.

HORSHAM.

A crowded and influential meeting was held in the Assembly Room of the King Street Hotel, Horsham, on February 5th. Major Aldridge occupied the chair; and on the platform were also the Rev. G. O. Frost, Mr. P. Medwin, Mr. W. L. Thomas, Mr. W. Lintott, jun., and Mr. R. Hunt. Miss Becker and Miss Beedy attended as a deputation. In the course of his remarks, the Chairman stated that he had lately seen a letter from the Prime Minister, expressing warm interest in Mr. Forsyth's Bill, and stating that next to the Government measures it was the one he had most at heart. The resolutions were carried unanimously, and the meeting concluded with a vote of thanks to the chairman.

CROYDON.

A very successful public meeting was held on February 16th, in the new Lecture Hall, Croydon, Mr. Arthur Arnold in the chair. The speakers were Mr. Arthur Arnold, Miss Fenwick Miller, Miss C. A. Biggs, Miss Ramsay, the Rev. R. Rodolph Saffield, Mr. Henry Moore, Mr. W. F. Malleon. The usual resolutions and votes of thanks were carried.

DUDLEY.

A meeting was held on February 8th in the Public Hall, Dudley, Joseph Stokes, Esq., Mayor, occupied the chair, and the deputation consisted of Miss Becker, Miss C. A. Biggs, and Mrs. Ashford. There were several local speakers, and the usual resolutions in support of Mr. Forsyth's Bill were carried unanimously.

DERBY.

A public meeting in support of Mr. Forsyth's Women's Disabilities Removal Bill, was held in the Town Hall, Derby, on February 9th. Mr. Alderman Longdon, J.P., occupied the chair, and was supported by Miss Becker, Miss Caroline Biggs, Mrs. Clayton, Mr. John Bailey, J.P., Mr. Wm. Legge, Mr. H. Steer, Mr. A. W. Pollard, and Mr. Constantine. There was a very good attendance. Letters of apology were read by the Chairman from Mr. T. W. Evans, M.P., Mr. Plimsoll, M.P., and Mr. Alderman Renals, the last-named of whom amongst other arguments in favour of this movement, urged that if they could have only one burgess-list for parliamentary as well as municipal purposes, it would save the town at least £100 a year. The usual resolutions were carried unanimously.

IRONBRIDGE.

On February 9th, a crowded meeting was held in the Assembly Rooms, Ironbridge. The chair was occupied by the Rev. S. Evans, and the deputation consisted of Mrs. Ashford, of Birmingham, Miss F. Fenwick Miller, of London, and the Rev. W. Winn Robinson, of Walsall. The local speakers were the Rev. Thos. Jones, Mr. W. Evans, Councillor Randall, Mr. Reuben Wilcox, and Mr. James Page. The resolutions were carried unanimously.

BRIDGNORTH.

A largely attended public meeting was held on Feb. 10th, in the Agricultural Hall, Bridgnorth. The chair was occupied by Mr. Alderman Whatmore. The first resolution was briefly moved by the Rev. D. D. Evans, and seconded by Mr. Councillor McMichael. The resolution was supported by Miss Fenwick Miller, and by the Rev. T. G. Crippen. It was carried without opposition. The second resolution, adopting petitions and memorials, was moved by Mr. T. C. Burton, who, from personal knowledge, cited a case in which a widow was evicted from a farm solely because the landlord was a strong politician, and as the widow could not vote it would weaken his interest. The resolution was seconded by the Rev. Winn Robinson, supported by Miss Becker, and carried.

GLASGOW.

At a well-attended meeting of the Lyceum in connection with the St. Vincent Street Unitarian Church, Glasgow, held on February 11, the Rev. John Page Hopps in the chair, a petition to Parliament was ordered to be signed by the chairman and forwarded to Mr. Anderson, M.P., for presentation.—*Glasgow Herald*, Feb. 13.

Miss Craigen addressed meetings on February 5th in the Co-operative Hall, BEDLINGTON, near Morpeth, Mr. James Davidson in the chair; and on February 15th in the Free Methodist Chapel, SKEGBY, Notts., Mr. Willis Ward, of Mansfield, in the chair. Petitions were adopted in favour of the Bill.

CASES UNDER THE MARRIAGE LAW.

The following cases illustrative of the laws affecting married women have appeared before the courts during the past month.

THE INVESTMENT OF MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY.

(Before the Master of the Rolls.) Feb. 1.

HOWARD v. THE BANK OF ENGLAND.

This was a suit to compel the Bank of England to transfer a sum of £107. 12s. 3d. Consols into the name of Rose Ellen Lenton, a married woman, without requiring the consent of her husband, who had deserted her. The case involved an important question under the Married Women's Property Act 1870, with reference to a married woman's property in the funds. It is provided by section 7 of the Act that "when any woman married after the passing of the Act shall during her marriage become entitled to any sum of money not exceeding £200 under any will, such property shall, subject and without prejudice to the trusts of any settlement affecting the same, belong to the woman for her separate use, and her receipt alone shall be a good discharge for the same; and by section 3 that any married woman may apply to the Bank of England that any sum in the funds not being less than £20 to which the woman is entitled, may be transferred to, or made to stand in the books of the Bank in the name of the woman as a married woman entitled to her separate use, and on such name being entered in the books accordingly the same shall be deemed to be the separate property of such woman, and shall be transferred and the dividends paid as if she were unmarried." Mrs. Lenton was married in May, 1872, and in June, 1874, she became entitled to this sum of stock, which represented a legacy of £100 bequeathed to her, and by the provisions of the Married Women's Property Act 1870, it belonged to her for her separate use. The stock was standing in the names of two trustees and of Mrs. Lenton, and they applied to the Bank to permit the same to be transferred into the name of Mrs. Lenton alone, so that it might stand in their books in her name as a married woman, entitled to her separate use, under the 3rd section of the Married Women's Property Act 1870. The Bank refused, and thereupon this bill was filed by the two trustees and Mrs. Lenton, to which the Bank put in a demurrer.

Mr. Kekewich argued for the Bank that the concurrence of the husband was necessary. And Mr. Tremllett for the plaintiffs contended that the effect of section 3 entitled Mrs. Lenton to have the property for her separate use.

The Master of the Rolls decided that the Act did not give the plaintiffs the right to transfer the stock without the consent of Mrs. Lenton's husband. He could not hold that the Bank authorities could dispense with the presence of the husband, and allowed the demurrer.

THE RIGHT OF A HUSBAND TO USE PHYSICAL FORCE TO HIS WIFE.

MARLBOROUGH-STREET.—FEB. 1.

Mr. Capron, solicitor, applied to Mr. Newton for a summons against a military gentleman who had threatened to use force to compel his wife to live with him. Mr. Capron said the lady had not lived with her husband for the last seven years. There were good reasons for desiring to separate from him, but the husband had threatened, if she did not return to him, to use all the means in his power to compel her. Under these circumstances he had been instructed to apply for a summons against the husband for using threatening language. Mr. Newton said the husband had a right to the company of his

wife, and was justified in using any means in his power to oblige her to return to his home. Mr. Capron asked if the husband was entitled to use force. Mr. Newton considered he was if the wife refused to return peaceably. Mr. Capron referred to several judicial decisions on the subject, and argued that the husband was only entitled to proceed against his wife for the restitution of conjugal rights in the Ecclesiastical Court.

Mr. Newton said the husband might certainly take that course, but he was also entitled to use others to oblige his wife to return to him. How could he grant a summons on the allegation of something that might never take place?

Mr. Capron was prepared to prove that threats of force had been used, and that the lady, who was in court, was ready to depose that she went in bodily fear.

A gentleman came forward and said that the husband of the lady had threatened to take his wife by force from the custody of her friends.

Mr. Newton declined to grant the summons. If he were wrong the solicitor could go before a Judge in Chambers and get an opinion; he should be happy to be set right by the decision of a higher tribunal.

Mr. Capron thanked the magistrate, and said he should act on the suggestion.

A MOTHER'S RIGHTS DENIED.

The Dublin correspondent of the *Standard* states that in the Court of Queen's Bench there, on February 4th, a return was made to the writ of habeas corpus, granted at the instance of a Roman Catholic man, named Lennon, against his wife, who is a Protestant, to compel her to produce their four children—a boy and three girls. She alleged that he was not fit to have the custody of the children, but the Court held that the father's legal right to the children (except as to the eldest boy) was incontestable. The Lord Chief Justice, however, suggested that the mother should submit a fuller case to Chancery as to his being fit to have charge of them. The eldest boy was informed that he could decide for himself, and he decided to remain with his mother. Then Mrs. Lennon exclaimed in a piteous voice, "Oh, my Lord, show mercy to me and my children." The little ones cried loudly and clung to her, saying, "Mother, don't leave us!" The Lord Chief Justice: I have the strongest opinion that this is just the case that the Act of 1873 was intended to meet, and I am not sure that the children ought to be handed over till the Chancellor determines the matter. Their lordships were preparing to leave when the father of the children came forward and caught hold of one of the children. She clung to her mother, who placed her arm around her. The father sought to take her forcibly off. As the mother held her, and both she and the children, except the boy, wept loudly, the Lord Chief Justice called to the sheriff, "Sheriff, seize that man." Lennon having been brought forward, the Lord Chief Justice, addressing him, asked, "Are you the father?" Lennon said, "Yes, my lord." The Lord Chief Justice: Observe now you are standing there in my presence. As sure as you are a living man if you injure these children you will suffer for it. In my opinion the children ought not to be handed over to this man to-night. The Sub-Sheriff: Don't interfere with them now. The Lord Chief Justice then withdrew, followed by Mr. Justice O'Brien. The children clung around their mother's neck and cried with loud voices. Several gentlemen urged Mrs. Lennon to go with her husband, and he would provide her with another home. After much entreaty she consented to go with him, and, taking the little ones by the hand, the whole party left by a side door, and, getting into a cab, drove off.

MARRIED WOMEN AND THEIR EMPLOYERS.

At the Blackburn County Petty Sessions, on February 10th, Alice Ellison, a married woman, a four-loom weaver at Messrs. Whiteley and Co.'s mill, at Livesey, was summoned for leaving work without notice, and £2 8s. was claimed as compensation for the looms standing idle a fortnight.—Mr. Dean, solicitor, who represented the defendant, contended that a married woman was not liable to penal consequences, and that she was incapable of making a contract of this nature which would be binding upon her, such a state of things being contrary as well to the rights of the husband as to the policy of the law. Mr. Dean having quoted a case in his favour, Mr. Holland, solicitor, said, in reply, that a special clause in the Married Women's Property Act of 1870 provided against any such construction of the law. If Mr. Dean's contention was correct it would be in the power of women to bring many large manufactories in the county to a standstill.—The magistrates awarded 20s. damages and costs, the Chairman remarking that if married women were not liable to be called upon to keep their contracts with their employers, masters would be discouraged from engaging them. The Bench granted a case for a superior court; and, as the number of married women employed in the mills of Lancashire and the neighbouring counties is very large, it is eminently desirable that the extent of their responsibility should be determined.

PETITIONS.

HOUSE OF LORDS.—MONDAY, FEBRUARY 15TH.

Lord ACTON presented a petition from inhabitants of Bridgnorth praying for the removal of the electoral disabilities of women.

The Duke of BEDFORD (for Lord WENLOCK) presented a petition from inhabitants of Ironbridge against the exclusion of women from the franchise.

HOUSE OF COMMONS. PUBLIC PETITIONS—FIRST REPORT. 8—12 February, 1875.

I. Parliament.

WOMEN'S DISABILITIES REMOVAL BILL—In Favour.

Table listing petitions for the Women's Disabilities Removal Bill, including dates, locations, and petitioners.

Table listing various petitions with details on dates, locations, and petitioners.

Table listing petitions on the left side of the page, including dates, locations, and petitioners.

Table listing petitions on the right side of the page, including dates, locations, and petitioners.

Total number of Petitions 71—Signatures 27,721

SECOND REPORT. 15—16 February, 1875.

Table listing petitions under the Second Report, including dates, locations, and petitioners.

Total number of Petitions 111—Signatures 42,854

The petitions marked thus * are substantially similar to that from Southwark [APP. 3]. The petitions marked thus † are similar to that from Northampton [APP. 4]. The petitions marked thus § are similar to that from Inverness [APP. 5]. The petitions marked thus ¶ have the addresses of some or all of the petitioners affixed. The petitions marked thus § are signed officially. [The Appendix containing the text of the Petitions will be found on the second page of advertisements facing the leading article.]

BIRMINGHAM BRANCH OF THE SOCIETY. CONTRIBUTIONS RECEIVED SINCE SEPTEMBER, 1874.

Table listing contributions received since September 1874, with names and amounts.

ELIZA ASHFORD, Treasurer, £24 4 6 Office: 4, Broad Street Corner. 3, Speedwell Road, Edgbaston.

MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS RECEIVED DURING FEBRUARY, 1875.

	£	s.	d.
Mr. Thos. Thomasson	130	0	0
Miss Helen Bright-Clark	1	1	0
Miss Knott	1	0	0
Mrs. Bradney	1	0	0
Mrs. Weiss	1	0	0
Mr. Henry Biggs	1	0	0
Mr. S. Marshall	0	10	0
Rev. A. W. Worthington	0	5	0
Mrs. Letherbrow	0	5	0
Mr. John Rhoades (Thirsk)	0	5	0
Mr. R. Pearson	0	5	0
Mrs. W. Ayre (Thirsk)	0	5	0
Rev. T. Gasquoine	0	5	0
Mrs. Bleakley	0	5	0
Miss Porter	0	5	0
Mr. James Hill	0	5	0
Mrs. Meeke	0	5	0
B. E.	0	5	0
Mr. Yearley	0	2	6
Mrs. Woodhead (Leeds)	0	2	6
Mrs. Todd	0	2	6
Mrs. Stroyan	0	2	6

WALSALL (Continued).

Mr. Thos. Cleckley (Mayor)	1	1	0
Dr. Machlachan	1	1	0
Rev. F. Groome Littlecott	0	5	0
Mr. Job Wilkes	0	5	0
Mr. Jos. Dixon	0	5	0
Mr. W. R. Scanlan	0	5	0
Mr. W. H. Kirby	0	2	6
Mr. F. P. Hubbard	0	2	6
Mr. A. D. Aulton	0	2	6
Mr. Thos. Blinkhorn	0	2	6
Mr. Jonathan Ellis	0	2	0
Mr. Davis	0	1	0
Mr. Bates	0	1	0

DERBY.

Mr. J. Roe, junr.	3	3	0
Mr. J. Longden	0	10	6
Mr. Alderman Renals	0	10	6
Miss M. H. Towle	0	10	6
Misses Holbrooke	0	10	6
Mrs. Roe	0	10	0
Mr. W. Branton	0	10	0
Mr. A. Lane	0	10	0
Mr. Thos. Copestick	0	7	6
Mr. James Owen	0	5	0
Mr. Pollard	0	5	0
Mr. George	0	5	0
Mr. Wm. Hull	0	5	0
Mr. A. C. Ellis	0	5	0
Mr. James Ragg	0	5	0
Mr. Samuel Hall	0	2	6
Mr. Joseph Jones	0	2	6
Mr. Hobson	0	2	6
Mrs. Madeley	0	1	0

WOLVERHAMPTON.

Mr. S. C. Mander	1	1	0
Mr. W. Edwards	1	1	0
Mr. Chas. F. Clark	1	0	0
Mr. M. Bayliss	0	10	0
Mr. R. Markland	0	3	0
Mr. J. J. Newbould	0	2	6
Mr. John Jones	0	2	6

LICHFIELD.

Mr. Charles Simpson	1	0	0
Mr. R. Crosskey	0	10	0
Mr. J. C. McLean	0	5	0
Mr. J. Southern	0	2	6
Mr. Charles Gillard	0	2	6
Miss C. M. Egginton	0	2	6
Mrs. Heape	0	2	0

£157 17 6

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 107, Upper Brook-street; 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, 294, Regent Street, London, W., from January 20th to February 20th, 1875.

	£	s.	d.
Lady Anna Gore-Langton	50	0	0
Mrs. Pennington	50	0	0
A Friend, by Mrs. Jacob Bright	40	0	0
Mrs. Pochin	25	0	0
Mrs. Charles Holland	20	0	0
Mrs. Thos. Taylor	10	0	0
Miss Williams	10	0	0
Mrs. Sims (Donation and subscription)	7	2	0
Miss Allen	5	0	0
The Hon. Emmeline Canning	5	0	0
Lady Goldsmid	5	0	0
Mr. and Mrs. F. Malleson	1	0	0
Mrs. Glover	1	1	0
Miss Holland	1	0	0
Miss Bonus	0	5	0
Mr. and Mrs. Charlesworth	0	5	0
Mrs. Haslam	0	5	0
Mr. Turner	0	5	0
A Friend	0	2	6
Mrs. Gardner	0	1	0

£231 6 6

ALFRED W. BENNETT, Treasurer.

BRISTOL AND WEST OF ENGLAND BRANCH OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS RECEIVED SINCE JANUARY 20th, 1875.

	£	s.	d.
A Friend	100	0	0
Mrs. Charles Thomas	5	0	0
Lady Anna Gore Langton	1	0	0
The Misses Priestman	1	1	0
Miss M. J. Briggs	1	1	0
Mr. Grenfell	1	1	0
Mrs. Grenfell	1	0	0
Mrs. Price	1	0	0
Mrs. Russel Carpenter	1	0	0
Ditto (Donation)	1	0	0
F. B. by M. C.	1	0	0
Mrs. Davies	1	0	0
Miss Price	0	10	0
Mrs. W. Colfax (Donation)	0	10	0
Mrs. Smith	0	5	0
Mrs. de l'Hoste	0	10	0
Mrs. Goss	0	5	0
Mr. Lloyd	0	5	0
Miss Mabel Hincks	0	5	0
Mr. W. Weaver	0	5	0
Miss M. Gibson	0	5	0
Mrs. Rendall	0	5	0
Mrs. Reynolds	0	5	0
Miss G. Stephens	0	5	0
Miss Wansey	0	5	0
Mrs. Colman	0	5	0
Mr. Solomon	0	5	0
Mr. Rosser	0	5	0
Dr. Farrar (Marlborough)	0	5	0
Mr. C. Sankey	0	5	0
Rev. J. S. Thomas	0	5	0
Mr. F. Storr	0	5	0
Miss Lutley	0	2	6
Mrs. Bowcher	0	2	6
Miss Gibson	0	2	6
Mrs. Reader	0	2	6
The Mayor of Penzance	0	2	6
The Rev. — Peters	0	2	6
Mr. Chirgwin	0	2	6
Mr. Williams	0	2	0
Rev. — Hedgeland	0	2	0
Mr. Mitchell	0	2	0

£122 1 6

ALICE GRENFELL, 5, Albert Villas, Clifton,

Office: 53, Park Street, Bristol,

Treasurer.