

# WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

VOL. III.—No. 34. PUBLISHED MONTHLY.

MANCHESTER, DECEMBER 1, 1872.

PRICE 1d.—By Post 1½d.

## Contents :

Leading Article by the Editor.

Mr. Kirkman Hodgson, M.P., on Women's Suffrage.  
Public Meetings: Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage (Annual Meeting), Salford, Chorlton, Broughton, Hulme, Ashton-under-Lyne, Bolton, Sandbach, Hastings, Ryde, Sandown, Banbury.

Wales: Pontypool, Newport, Cardiff, Neath. Scotland: Campbelton, Falkirk, Lanark, Girvan, Lochwinnoch, Coatbridge, Neilston, Helensburgh, Strachan, Beith, Rothsay.  
Correspondence:—The Central Committee; International Association for Protecting the Rights of Women; The Oban Meeting.

Obituary: Mr. J. F. Maguire, M.P.; Sir John Bowring. Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage:—Treasurer's Report for November. The Property of Married Women. List of Committees.

THE movement in support of the Bill to remove the electoral disabilities of women has begun for the season in good earnest. From various parts of the country intelligence reaches us of large and enthusiastic meetings held to promote the measure. The list of meetings for November is incomparably larger than that at the corresponding period of former years, and it would transcend the limits of the space at our disposal to give an adequate account of them. Miss TAYLOUR and Miss MACLAREN have been holding a series of successful lectures in the Scotch burghs. In Lancashire several large and important meetings have been held, and Miss LILIAS ASHWORTH and Miss BIGGS, have had a triumphant progress in South Wales. In addition to these organised sets of meetings, many isolated ones have taken place in various districts, and for the coming months we are promised others, which will show an increase of activity and power all over the country. We especially desire to call attention to the conference and public meeting to be held at Birmingham on the 6th instant, and to express the hope that as many of our friends as can attend will be present on the occasion. At the conference a question on the best methods of promoting the cause will be submitted for discussion, and the result cannot fail to increase and to direct into the most useful channel the energy and activity of our friends.

The past month has not been devoid of incidents bearing on our question. We have had the claims of Peers to vote in the election of members of Parliament authoritatively rejected by the same court which in 1868 extinguished the political rights of women. Commenting on this decision, a contemporary observes:—"Those who are not of the Commons can have no right to make or meddle in the choice of their representatives. It is true that in very early times, Peers appear to have taken part in Parliamentary elections. At any rate there are numerous cases on record in which they signed the indenture of return. But these indentures were also often signed by

"women; and it was held by the Court of Common Pleas, when the question of the right of women to vote was under consideration, that the signature of the indenture of return was no proof of the exercise of the franchise. Considering how matters were managed during the Middle Ages, no inference either one way or the other could well be drawn from the fact that Peers occasionally appended their names to these documents. But a very strong inference did arise from the fact that, after an Act which was passed in the reign of HENRY VI. for regulating the duties of the sheriffs as returning officers, and securing their more strict performance, no further indentures of return were signed by Peers, nor is there the slightest ground to suppose that any attempt was made by them to exercise the franchise until the year 1699.

"That being the state of constitutional precedent, and the understanding of the greatest masters of constitutional lore, the Earl of MANCHESTER, in the year we have just mentioned, voted for Maldon. The circumstance being brought to the notice of the House of Commons, they lost no time in passing their famous resolution that no Peer had a right to vote in the election of members of Parliament. The House of Lords never questioned the law as laid down by the Commons, and, so far as is known, the question was never raised from 1699 to the present year."

Although there is some resemblance between the claims of Peers, and the claims of women, who possess the qualification prescribed by law, to vote in Parliamentary elections, there are very important differences in the principles and practice which have been followed in respect to such claims. The remarks which we have quoted above, omitting sentences irrelevant to the matter in hand, set forth the historical fact that up to the reign of KING HENRY VI., both Peers and women occasionally signed indentures returning members to the House of Commons. But it appears that after an Act passed in the reign of that monarch, securing the more strict performance of the

duties of returning officers, no further indentures were signed by Peers, and that up to the year 1699 no attempt was made by any Peer to exercise the franchise. When the Earl of MANCHESTER in that year voted for MALDON, the Commons immediately passed a resolution declaring Lords excluded from the privilege.

But the records show that after the Act of HENRY VI., which precluded Peers from taking part in elections, women continued to sign indentures of return as heretofore, and no objection was made either by Parliament or any other authority to the validity of such returns. In the reign of QUEEN MARY, the right of Mrs. COPLEY to return the member for Gatton was admitted without challenge, and in the succeeding reign of QUEEN ELIZABETH, Dame DOROTHY PACKINGTON returned the members for Aylesbury. The inference is therefore extremely strong, that the constitutional disability of Peers to return members to Parliament did not exist in regard to women. On the attempt of a Peer to take part in an election, the Commons instantly passed a resolution declaring the disability, but no such resolution in respect to women was ever passed by the Commons, while returns made by women were accepted as unquestionably legal.

The reason for excluding Peers is, that they are not of the Commons, and that they have a House of Lords whereby they can exercise control over legislation. Neither of these reasons apply to women. Women are a portion of the Commons, and they have no means of controlling legislation affecting their interests save through influencing the House of Commons. From this influence they are at the present moment legally, though, as we hold, most unconstitutionally debarred.

Although the main question as to the electoral rights of women and Lords was determined in the same direction by the judgment of the Court of Common Pleas, there is a difference in detail which is highly significant. The Lords who appealed against the decision of the revising barrister were condemned in the costs of the suit. The appeal of the five thousand women against the decision in the revision court in Manchester was dismissed without costs. The judgment declared that, on account of the great public importance of the question, it was one which ought to have been brought before the court, and therefore costs should not be required. But the judgment in the MARQUIS OF SALISBURY'S case concerned the electoral rights of a whole estate of the realm. That in the Manchester case concerned those of a part of one estate of the realm. It would seem as if the public importance of the former

case must be at least equal to that of the latter. The inference appears irresistible that in the case of Peers there was no reasonable doubt as to their legal incapacity to vote, and that in the case of women freeholders and householders there was such reasonable doubt as to justify these in appealing to the Court. It is greatly to be lamented that in pronouncing a sentence of deprivation and exclusion the Judges did not give to those whose rights and liberties were at stake the benefit of this doubt.

#### MR. KIRKMAN HODGSON, M.P., ON WOMEN SUFFRAGE.

In addressing his constituents at Bristol, a few days ago, Mr. Kirkman Hodgson is reported to have said: "He believed he had never voted on any subject of public interest in the opposite lobby to Mr. Morley. Of course there were some subjects on which they disagreed. . . . He voted in a different lobby the other night in a matter concerning ladies, but he did not think many of those present were interested in it, as most of them he believed were married, or very soon would be. They had been in the same lobby every time that matters of importance had been brought forward, this year or last year, in favour of liberty, progress, and reform." Mr. Kirkman Hodgson, by his own confession, does not regard a question which affects the rights of women as one of *public interest*, or the extension of the franchise to all householders a matter of importance in reform. It is true that the Women's Disabilities Removal Bill, which is the "matter concerning ladies" in which he votes against Mr. Morley, directly affects the personal status of sixteen millions of Her Majesty's subjects. But as these sixteen millions of subjects have not one vote in the election of Her Majesty's Government, members of Parliament can afford to treat "matters concerning them" as of no public interest or importance. In the city of Bristol there are 2,412 women householders, the vast majority of whom are probably not in the condition supposed by Mr. Hodgson to be that of the majority of the ladies who heard him, either married or soon to be married. If these householders had in their hands 2,412 votes in the representation of Bristol, as they ought to have were household suffrage really the law of the land, no member for Bristol would be found to declare publicly that matters concerning them were of no public interest, or lightly to dismiss their claims with a false and thoughtless jest.

BACUP.—On November 7th the annual meeting for the distribution of prizes to the successful pupils of the Bacup Mechanics' Institution was held. The prizes were distributed by Miss Lydia E. Becker, member of the Manchester School Board. After the pupils had received their prizes, Miss Becker delivered an address, treating of the need for better provision for the education of girls and women. The address was most attentively listened to and frequently applauded.—From the *Bacup Times*.

It is said that a sister of Mr. Spurgeon is preaching with much success at Willingham, in Cambridgeshire, where her husband is a Baptist minister. The cases from Willingham tried before the local bench have decreased to such an extent that the police authorities have expressed their thanks to the lady preacher as being the instrument of the improvement.

## PUBLIC MEETINGS.

### MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

The fifth annual meeting of the Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage was held in the Mayor's Parlour, Town Hall, King-street, on November 6th. Mr. Jacob Bright, M.P., presiding. There was a crowded attendance, the ladies forming the major part of the meeting.

Miss BECKER read the report of the Executive Committee, which has been published in another form.

The TREASURER (Rev. Mr. Steintal) reported that the income of the society for the preceding year amounted to £1,994. 14s. 2d., as compared with an expenditure of £1,153. 13s. 5d., the balance being £841.

The CHAIRMAN said: This is the fifth annual meeting of the Manchester National Women's Suffrage Association. Five years ago, with very small beginnings, you entered upon a public career. Wherever your proceedings at that time became known, they excited in some quarters surprise, and, probably, in many quarters they were the subject of ridicule. Very few believed that you had a great and settled purpose. Year by year, however, you continued your labours, and I may say you continued them with growing success. Now you have a rapidly-increasing number of adherents, and, as the treasurer has told you, the exchequer becomes more amply filled. You and the kindred associations hold crowded meetings in almost every considerable borough in the United Kingdom. In fact, it must, I think, even by the opponents of this cause, be admitted, that a powerful organisation is extending itself over the whole country, and that if it continues to grow, if your operations increase as they have increased, your demands, before a very long time, will be sufficiently strong to induce Parliament to grant what you seek. The object which this association has in view is a very simple one. I think I have a right to say that it is moderate and reasonable. You ask that women who are the heads of families, who are householders, whose names are on the ratebook, and who fulfil the ordinary obligations of citizenship, should have the common privilege of helping to determine what man should represent the town or district in Parliament where they happen to reside. You deny that household suffrage has been given to the boroughs of the United Kingdom, seeing that there are many houses passed over, many homes denied the vote where intelligent beings are to be found, with human thoughts, human feelings, and skilful hands. You notice that in every constitutional country men are demanding, with more and more urgency, their right to be admitted within the political pale. You must see that men everywhere, of every class, down to the very humblest, prize highly this political privilege. Well, is this a delusion under which men are labouring? Are they grasping at a shadow, or following a phantom? No. Everybody knows that it is no delusion. The moment that men get in possession of a vote they have a feeling of security which they never had before. They have generally an increase of prosperity. They feel a greater degree of self-respect, and they command a greater amount of respect from those around them. Will anyone point out to me the reason why women should be denied every particle of political protection, when men would not dare to trust their rulers for a single session of Parliament in the absence of efficient control? I am not sure whether the well-known passage from the "Merchant of Venice" is not applicable in this case, "Hath not a woman hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions, fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warned

and cooled by the same winter and summer as a man is?" And may I not ask if you place burdens upon her, does she not feel the weight of these burdens? If you pass an unjust law does she not resent it? In this country we have a tender regard to the electoral rights of men. The returned convict is an elector; the lunatic, if he happen to have a lucid interval at the proper time, can give a vote; the occasional pauper, the man who has been in the workhouse and may be there again, the habitual drunkard, if by a special effort he can pronounce the candidate's name, so as to make himself intelligible at the polling booth—all these men are consulted as to whether Mr. Gladstone or Mr. Disraeli should hold the reins of power. But a woman may be the worthy head of an educational establishment; she may be eminent in literature and science; she may, as a widow, have brought up a respectable family with infinite self-denial and with constant labour; or she may be a lady of wealth and of rank living in a mansion, whose servants have votes where she has not. A woman may find herself in any one of these positions, but she is still excluded from political influence. In fact, the most miserable and incapable of men are carefully included; women the most exalted, whether from character, from birth, or rank, are carefully excluded. But nobody believes that this state of the case can remain. It rests with yourselves how long it shall remain. (Applause.) There ought to be no mistake as to the nature of the question you have got before you. Though you are women who are seeking this, you will have to pay—and it is right you should have to pay—the same price for your political enfranchisement which men have had to pay for theirs. That price, I think, is summed up in the words—patience, courage, intellectual resources, sustained resolution. One thing is in your favour. You have a just people to deal with. I believe the people of this country have as keen a sense of justice as the people in any country in the world; and when a demand is made—when it is reiterated—so as to become intelligible to the average individual of the land, then I believe that demand is always granted. In argument, so far as I have been able to discover, your opponents are not powerful against you. (Hear, hear.) The reason is that your own position is so strong. In theory, nobody disputes with you at all. Every Englishman will admit that representation should accompany taxation, and every Englishman will admit that in a free country those who have to obey the laws should have at least some moderate control over those who make the laws. On practical grounds, happily—no, I ought rather to say unhappily—you are just as strong as on theoretical grounds. The inequalities of the law with regard to women are far greater—ten-fold greater—than they were a few years ago with regard to the men who were excluded from the franchise. Well, these inequalities are not dealt with by governments in this country, or are dealt with only to a very small extent, and, as it appears to me, for a very simple reason. The Government—either this, or the preceding, or any that are to come—governments generally in England are overwhelmed with work. You know the vast claims that are made upon them from every part of the country, and from every class in the community. There is only a certain portion of the work which they can do, and which is it, do you think, that they will be likely to do? Why, they work for their masters; they work for those who can sustain them at the poll; they work for those who can put questions when a member comes before his constituency, and who can vote for his return to Parliament. Sometimes, as you know, non-official members of the House of Commons will try to remedy some of those inequalities. They do it with almost insuperable difficulty, and the consequence is that they do it sometimes very badly. Here is a case in point.

You have heard a good deal of the Married Women's Property Bill. A little while ago, when a man married he married not only his wife, but her property and her debts. When that Bill was passed, some two years ago, it was passed in this bungling fashion that a man was allowed to marry his wife and her property, but he was entirely free from any responsibility with regard to her debts. Imagine the justice of such a state of things. I have heard of that over and over again from large warehouses in Manchester, which are accustomed to deal with shops throughout the country, many of which are kept by women. Before that Bill was passed, of course the warehouse here was safe in dealing with women traders in the country. But now a woman may be married to-morrow morning, the warehouse here knowing nothing about it, and everything she has may be swept away by her husband, and nobody is responsible for her debts. The suffrage question has made considerable advance by the changes in municipal elections and by the School Board elections. It seems almost impossible that after these steps we should not go on to something wider and more just, and so add another example to the truth that in England

Freedom broadens slowly down  
From precedent to precedent.

Let me point out just for a moment the difference between the local and Parliamentary vote as women are affected. They have now universally, I believe, the local vote. In the village where I live—and of course it is not an exception to small places generally—they have half-a-dozen votes if they happen to be women of property; that is to say, they vote in proportion to the taxes they pay. Well, they would be very unwilling, of course, to give up the local vote anywhere. It is of some consequence, but it is of almost no value at all as compared with the Parliamentary vote, and I will tell you why. Whatever may be the case when we come to social legislation (about which we hear a good deal said) in local government so far men and women have been treated absolutely alike. They deal with men and women as ratepayers, and make no distinction. But when you go to Parliament you find that it deals in a totally different manner with men and women. It may be right it should be so. I am not going to raise that question here; but the fact that it deals in a different manner with the two sexes—passing one set of laws for one, and another set of laws for the other—will enable you to see in a moment how much more important the Parliamentary vote is for women. One word I would like to say with regard to my connection with this subject. In endeavouring to help this cause, I have not had, nor was it reasonable that I should have expected to receive the sympathy of all my old political friends. Some have thought that to place a moderate number of women upon the electoral roll would weaken the Liberal party. I have no data to enable me to form a judgment upon this question. It would require an intimate knowledge of the facts over a large area of country. I know that in some municipal elections a majority of women have given their votes to Conservatives; I know that in other municipal elections a majority of women have given their votes to Liberals; but, however this may be, I hope that no member for Manchester would be willing, in his public conduct, to subordinate national to party interests. ("Hear, hear," and applause.) How this measure—supposing it to be carried—would affect the Liberal party, I do not know. That it would benefit the nation I have the most unshaken conviction—(hear, hear)—because it would inevitably give us more equal, and, therefore, juster laws; it would enable Parliament to look at women's questions with the same care that it now gives to other questions. It would arm it with the power, for I, as a member of Parliament, know perfectly well that without wishing to neglect any portion of the community, I am much less likely to neglect it if it has

some control over me. (Hear, hear.) More than two-thirds of the members who have voted with me on the question have come from the Liberal benches. If it had not been so, I should have been very much surprised. If the Liberal party were capable of putting itself in antagonism to a moderate representation of the people, it would have to change its name; it would have to take an epithet indicative not of high and liberal, but of narrow purposes. We must remember that in politics, as in everything else in the world, nothing is stationary; that with each new generation new questions arise; and in dealing with new questions we should soon get into confusion, possibly into inextricable error, if we did not bring them to the light of long-established principles. This is what I have endeavoured to do in regard to your claims, and hence the course I have adopted. And will not the past support me when I say, in reference to the two great parties in the State, that the one which takes the most generous view of the rights and safeguards of the people, the one which endeavours most to conform its political conduct to the great and glorious maxims of our constitution, will in the long run possess the confidence of the nation, and enjoy most frequently the management of its affairs? (Cheers.)

DR. PANKHURST moved the adoption of the report. He was sure that all present felt the value of the report which had been read by Miss Becker, and of the speech to which they had just listened. Taken together, the one as a record of facts, and the other as a series of deductions from these facts, he thought they should be agreed that the present position of this movement was one of steady and hopeful progress. Both in and out of Parliament the movement possessed every sign and mark that it would achieve a great and signal triumph at no distant date. With regard to the movement out of Parliament, it was impossible to address one's mind to a single feature of the agitation which did not show evidence that it is seizing deep hold of the best mind of the country. In considering the success of their action out of Parliament, it would be unjust and wrong not to recognize how much they owed to the services, the sagacity and enthusiasm of their secretary, Miss Becker. (Hear, hear.) Her achievements in this great work had earned for her a distinguished place in the goodwill of her fellow countrymen and countrywomen. If they looked to their work in Parliament, they had the same reasons for confidence and for congratulation. Certainly, when they heard the convincing and persuasive speech of Mr. Bright from the chair that day, they would have some ground for perceiving how it was that he had been able to make so much way in the House of Commons. Who could doubt but that his victory in obtaining the municipal franchise was itself a triumph of political sagacity, was itself one of the most powerful means whereby the other half of the movement would be finally conquered for them? When they looked at the services which Mr. Bright had rendered them in the past, they might be quite sure that they possessed in him a leader at once so powerful and so persuasive that any movement of great magnitude and of great interest to the country could be entrusted to no hands either more useful or more likely to command success. (Cheers.) Turning to the question of money, which he admitted was a low and inferior test, but was some indication of the kind of feeling which English people took in such movements, he was astonished as he was delighted, to notice through how many channels many and great gifts came to that association. These proved how deep and widespread the feeling was in favour of their object. There were in thousands of homes hearts beating anxiously and earnestly for the success of their objects, which showed clearly that some in the country had not fully estimated the breadth and depth of the necessity of putting electoral power in

the hands of women. He asked them to see behind the gifts of many, an amount of feeling, of suffering, of passionate enthusiasm which could not find other means of expressing itself than by sending these aids to the committee. Surely there must be a great reason why a movement which proposed to effect so great a change in practice upon the administration of public affairs, had achieved such signal success in the short period of five years. It was to no accidental or superficial causes that this success was due, but to the fact that it was a part of the great movement which had transformed modern Europe from mediæval conditions to the conditions of progress in which we now lived. If they were asked what it was that constituted the difference between the policy and principles which underlay the administration of public affairs in all the progressive peoples of the world as compared with the principles and policy that used to govern the affairs of mankind in past times, they must say that it was characterised by two features, first the abolition of class subjection, and second the removal of individual disability. The whole history of the political life of modern Europe was summed up in the success of these two things. Class after class that was put under political and social subjection had conquered its way into the constitution of the country and had been incorporated into the national life. No class in our country, except the class of woman, now remained outside the constitution. Every class had conquered its place within the constitution, and become incorporated into the practical, active, responsible life of the nation. Had that not been attended with immense success by an outgoing life from these classes, the very existence of which was unknown, and the power of which was never even so much as dreamt of? If by this gradual abolition of class subjection such immense results had been achieved, how much more ought they to expect and desire that another great class possessing characteristics, qualities, and virtues so necessary to the health of national life, should, like the rest, be admitted within the confines of the constitution, and be enabled to do again for this country the double service of growth, development, and elevation for itself, and power, influence, and progress for the nation. (Cheers.) It was, therefore, quite clear what the reasons were that made this movement so successful; it was quite apparent why there were no reasons and arguments against it. With regard to the second point, that of the removal of individual disabilities, it was evident how talents had been quickened into vigour and new vitality when society had proclaimed that there was an open career for all. Was it not, however, quite apparent to every thoughtful man that the weight and burden of public duty now lying on the citizens of this country were increasing so tremendously that the entire system of English public life was breaking down, because men were not able to go through the full stress and strain of the work which their conscience and their position imposed upon them. This was too apparent, and yet it was one of the results necessary in every attempt to govern a nation on the principles of progress and capacity. An infinite supply of genius, ability, and enthusiasm, expressed in individuality, was waiting to be admitted into the constitution, and waiting to serve the country. (Cheers.) Why should they not apply to women the grand and stirring maxim of an open career for talent? When social questions were coming to the front, did not we want increasingly the aid which these emancipated political units would contribute to the political life. They wanted it; they must have it, and soon they should have it. Women pleaded for the franchise as a stepping stone to their obtaining higher education. Upon every ground of justice, even on the ground of the inequalities of the sex—for the argument of intellectual inferiority forced the admission that there was the more need for the highest training possible being superadded to such gifts as she

possessed—she ought to have the means of receiving high education. But if it had been so enormously difficult for men to get good teaching with the franchise, it was perfectly impossible to get it for women without the franchise. There were two principal reasons why some objected. One was the mean and contemptible one exhibited in the difficulty women had in obtaining medical education—namely, professional jealousy, the very shamefulness of which would, he hoped soon cause it to disappear. Again it was perhaps felt that it would be uncomfortable to be posed intellectually by some charming woman. This feeling was, to a certain extent, expressed in Pope's lines—

In beauty or wit  
No mortal as yet  
To question your empire has dared—  
But men of discerning  
Have thought that in learning  
To yield to a lady was hard.

That was, however, a superficial and sentimental objection. He would urge that if women were under a natural disability, we should not add political injustice to their weakness. (Hear, hear.) We wanted to have every woman armed, first with the electoral franchise for self-defence, and then, armed with that weapon as a power for social service, to have her go forth and do work of citizenship, justice, and humanity. (Cheers.) For such reason as he had stated, they knew how invincible their position was, and how certain was their triumph. (Cheers.)

Mrs. LUCAS, in seconding the resolution, said: We have met here to-day to claim what we consider to be our right, the right of voting. It is no new thing for women to claim their rights in public, though some men think it very dreadful for women to appear on a public platform. If we turn back to the time of Moses, and read the first part of the twenty-seventh chapter of Numbers, we shall find that Zelophehad's five daughters stood up in the midst of all the congregation, to claim their right of inheritance. So far from treating them with contempt, Moses laid their cause before the Lord, and the Lord said, "These daughters spake right, and thou shalt cause the inheritance of their father to pass unto them." Turning to a more recent date, and taking a retrospect of our own time, I think we have good reason for congratulation, though the State still holds us on a level with idiots, lunatics, and felons. (Hear, hear.) But when we remember that only 30 years ago women delegated from the United States to the Anti-slavery Convention in London were forbidden by Englishmen to open their lips in that enlightened assembly, our position here to-day speaks for itself. We have strong faith that in the good time of the great Disposer of events we shall gain our claims, and become a really felt power; and let us remember what Sir John Coleridge said to the men of Exeter, the other day, that the power of any class must be felt before its wants will be attended to. One argument used against this movement is that if women have the vote they should serve in the army. The clergy, medical men, and lawyers have the vote, and they are not compelled to fight. (Hear, hear.) Less objection may be made to their serving on juries; indeed, some advantage might result from this. We have examples of the success of women jurors in America. In that far off country, which is brought so near to us by blood relationship, are two territories where women have the political franchise—one is Utah and the other Wyoming. The election in Salt Lake city last March for members of Congress and State Legislature proved to be one of the most orderly and peaceful elections—women voting. In Wyoming territory the suffrage has been held by the women now for more than two years. At the first election held at Cheyenne, reported to be the most wicked place for its size in the country, where fights and brawls prevailed throughout the day, and where

every man was armed, the moment a woman appeared in sight all contention ceased, every offensive word was hushed, and she was treated with the utmost deference. Not only in Wyoming do the women vote, but they sit on juries. "The first jury upon which women had been summoned was composed of six men and six women. The case was that of a man accused of murder. When giving the case their consideration, the men voted for acquittal in the face of strong evidence; the women contended for justice; and, after three days' deliberation, a verdict for manslaughter was returned, followed by a sentence of ten years' imprisonment. Before this, it had been impossible to convict for murder in that place. So much was the result approved that there had been women jurors ever since; and it is acknowledged that giving the franchise to women has had a most beneficial effect on men, on public elections, on the criminal classes, on home, and on the civilisation of the territory." (Hear, hear.) I do not quote these sentiments for any other purpose than to prove that women, when educated, are not the incapable beings generally supposed; and to show that true chivalry will still exist under the franchise, and that woman is worthy of being placed in a responsible position. (Applause.)

The resolution was then put to the meeting, and unanimously passed.

Miss STUART moved, "That this meeting hereby expresses its earnest thanks to Mr. Jacob Bright, Mr. E. B. Eastwick, Dr. Lyon Playfair, Mr. Heron, the Attorney-General, and the Right Hon. Sir Charles Adderley, for introducing and supporting the Women's Disabilities Bill, also to the members of the House of Commons who voted or paired in its favour in the division on the second reading of the measure on May 1, 1872; and respectfully requests Mr. Jacob Bright and his coadjutors to take steps for the re-introduction of the Bill at an early period of the forthcoming session."

Miss BECKER seconded the resolution, which was unanimously carried.

Mr. T. P. THOMASSON moved "that the following persons be the executive committee for the ensuing year: Jacob Bright, Esq., M.P., Mrs. Jacob Bright, Miss Barton, Miss Becker, Mrs. Butler, Thomas Chorlton, Esq., Rev. B. Glover, Mrs. Lucas, Mrs. R. R. Moore, Dr. Pankhurst, Rev. S. A. Steintal, Mrs. Sutcliffe, Mrs. J. P. Thomasson, Miss Alice Wilson."

Mrs. KING seconded the motion, which was unanimously passed.

Dr. Pankhurst having taken the chair, on the motion of Miss Alice Wilson, seconded by the Rev. S. A. Steintal, a vote of thanks was passed to Mr. Jacob Bright, M.P., for presiding.

Mr. BRIGHT, in acknowledging the vote, said he had only one fault to find with the meeting, and that was that his friends had had rather too much to say about him. They had, however, done that with a good intention. He was extremely obliged for the way in which they had passed the resolution last put to the meeting, which he noticed was always crowded, and he thought he might say enthusiastic. They were growing in numbers, and he thought they were also growing in influence. He hoped it would not be necessary to come together on that subject for many years longer, but he hoped that they would live to meet a year hence and be able on that occasion to report great progress. (Cheers.)

This concluded the proceedings.—*Abridged from the Manchester Examiner and Times.*

## SALFORD.

The first of a series of public meetings to be held in Manchester and Salford in favour of the extension of the Parliamentary suffrage to women ratepayers, was held in the Salford Town Hall, on November 13. Mr. Alderman McKerrow presided.

The CHAIRMAN said, as he understood it, their only object was to gain for women ratepayers a right to vote in the election of members of Parliament. Women had already a right to vote in municipal elections, and therefore they had precisely equal legal right to vote for parliamentary representatives. This was all the association asked for. The principle of giving votes to women who were ratepayers was so reasonable and consistent with common sense and justice that anyone who gave it an impartial consideration must readily admit it. It was considered that the late Reform Bill secured household suffrage, but the association argued that the necessary complement to make household suffrage complete was the admission of women voters in parliamentary elections.

Mr. GLOVER moved, "That the exclusion of women otherwise legally qualified from voting in the election of members of Parliament is injurious to those excluded, contrary to the principle of just representation and to that of the laws now in force regulating the election of municipal, parochial, and other representative governments."

Miss STUART seconded the motion. She said that in supporting this motion she felt that she was claiming rights to which women were entitled, and for the lack of which they suffered injustice and oppression. Notwithstanding the chairman's hint, she felt that she should not have clearly proved her case if she simply proved that women had a right to the vote. She might convince the reason of her audience that women ought to have the vote, but she could not so cordially claim their assistance as if she were able to demonstrate that women were sufferers from the want of the vote, and, therefore, she could not forbear from calling attention to those parts of the law which she believed to be unjust to women, and which she was sure could not remain as they were if women were represented in the Legislature of the country. She might refer to the marriage laws, under which women lost the power of property, or to the numerous social oppressions which she believed sprang from the political nonentity. Practically, no woman was judged by a jury of her peers, and she appealed to every newspaper reader to support her in the statement that crimes committed against women were not punished with the same severity as crimes committed against men. She felt that she would also be untrue to the convictions which she held very strongly if she did not also mention the educational disadvantages under which women suffered. Miss Stuart then gave a clear and forcible exposition of the objects of the Women's Suffrage Association, and argued that the extension of the suffrage to all ratepayers, women included, would be attended with general benefit to the State, and with special benefit to women, while if every woman received her rights to-morrow there was not a man who would be sixpence the worse. These positions were established by searching and telling argument, and illustrated with much humour and point. Miss Stuart concluded by saying that she unhesitatingly claimed the support of the Conservatives to a measure which was so in accordance with the spirit of the constitution; moderates must approve the moderation of the Association, and surely Radicals must haste to the assistance of a measure of radical reform. Above all, she felt that she could claim the help of the people. The measure which she advocated was one which must go to the heart of the British nation, for it was a measure whose watchword was "Liberty." (Cheers.)

Mr. Councillor MATHER supported the motion. The resolution was unanimously carried.

Mr. Councillor WALKER moved that a petition to both Houses of Parliament be adopted and signed by the chairman of the meeting, in favour of the right of women ratepayers to the franchise, and that memorials be addressed to the members for the borough requesting their support to Mr. Jacob Bright's

Bill. He stated that his experience as a returning officer at the recent municipal elections showed him that there were as many illiterate men voters as illiterate women voters, in proportion to their numbers on the register.

Mr. Councillor BAILEY seconded the motion, and Miss BECKER supported it.

The motion was unanimously carried.

Miss BECKER moved, and Miss STUART seconded, a vote of thanks to the chairman.

A gentleman in the body of the hall here got up, and warmly supported the motion. He reminded them that women, if they were ignorant and degraded, had been made so by men. He also pointed out that, naturally, women were the best managers in the family circle, and often more worthy of political power than men.

The motion was carried with cheers, and, after a vote of thanks to the two ladies who had addressed the meeting, the proceedings terminated.—*Abridged from the Manchester Examiner and Times.*

## CHORLTON.

The second of the series of district meetings was held on November 14th, in the Town Hall, Chorlton-on-Medlock, Manchester. Robert Whitworth, Esq., in the chair. Resolutions similar to those adopted at Salford were supported by Dr. Borchardt, Rev. T. Matthews, Miss Stuart, Mr. Councillor J. F. Roberts, and Miss Becker, and carried with one dissentient.

Some murmurs, apparently of dissent, having been heard during the speeches supporting the first resolution, the Chairman said anyone having an objection to make to the resolution could now have an opportunity of stating it.

A young man rose from his seat, apparently with the intention of addressing the meeting, but on being asked by the Chairman for his name, hesitated to give it. The Chairman, being supported by the meeting in his demand for the name, the intending speaker resumed his seat without giving expression to his opinions.

A vote of thanks to the Chairman for presiding closed the meeting.—*Abridged from the Manchester Examiner and Times.*

## BROUGHTON.

The third of the series of public meetings in support of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill for the Removal of the Electoral Disabilities of Women, was held on November 18, in the Broughton Town Hall. The chair was taken by Mr. Alderman Farrer. There were present Miss Lydia Becker, Miss Stuart, Mr. Councillor Dyson, and others. The meeting was crowded, a large proportion of those present being women. After some observations by the chairman, the usual resolutions were supported by Mr. Councillor Dyson, Mr. Councillor Nuttall, Miss Stuart, Mr. W. Warburton, Mr. Councillor Jones, and Miss Becker, and carried unanimously. A vote of thanks to Mr. Alderman Farrer, for presiding, was moved by Mrs. Moore, and seconded by Mrs. Beales, and carried, after which the meeting separated.

## HULME.

The fourth meeting of the series was held in the Hulme Town Hall on November 25th, Dr. Pankhurst in the chair. Amongst those on the platform were Miss Lydia E. Becker, the Rev. S. A. Steintal, Mr. Councillor Neild, Dr. John Watts, Mr. A. F. Winks, and others. The room was well filled, a large proportion of those present being women. Dr. John Watts, member of the Manchester School Board, moved the first resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Winks, and carried almost unanimously. Mr. Councillor Neild moved the adoption of a petition to both Houses of Parliament in favour of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill. Miss Lydia Becker seconded the resolution, which was carried unanimously. The meeting concluded with a vote of thanks to the chairman.

## ASHTON-UNDER-LYNE.

A meeting was held on November 21st in the Ashton Mechanics' Institution in support of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill to remove the electoral disabilities of women. Notwithstanding that Mr. T. W. Mellor was addressing his constituents in the Town Hall, there was a large attendance, especially of ladies. The chair was occupied by Mr. A. E. Reyner, and on the platform were Miss Lydia Becker, Miss Isabella Stuart, of Dundee; the Rev. Thomas Green, of Ashton; Rev. Norah Green, of Mottram; Rev. Benjamin Glover, of Middleton; Messrs. E. Fisher, Brown, and Councillor Sutcliffe. When the two ladies made their appearance on the platform they were received with a very enthusiastic round of cheers. After some remarks by the chairman, the Rev. Thomas Green, Congregational minister, moved a resolution affirming the principle of the Bill, which was seconded by Miss Stuart, and carried with acclamation. Councillor Sutcliffe moved, and Mr. Brown seconded, a resolution adopting petitions to Parliament in favour of the Bill, and memorials to the borough and county members praying them to support it. The resolution was supported by Miss Becker, who was received with prolonged cheering, and adopted unanimously. The Rev. Noah Green moved, and the Rev. B. Glover seconded, a resolution appointing a committee in connection with the National Society for Women Suffrage, which was also carried. Votes of thanks were then passed to Misses Becker and Stuart on the motion of Mr. E. Fisher, seconded by Mr. James Farron, and then to the chairman, on the motion of Miss Becker, seconded by Miss Stuart, and the meeting then broke up.—*Abridged from the Ashton Reporter.*

## BOLTON.

A public meeting was held in the Baths Assembly Room, on November 22nd, when there was a large attendance, including a considerable number of ladies. H. Lee, Esq., J.P., presided, and was supported on the platform by Miss Rhoda Garrett, of London, Miss Isabella Stuart, Miss Becker, Miss Agnes Garrett, and Mrs. Stephen Winkworth; J. Crook, Esq., J.P., J. P. Thomasson, Esq., and Messrs. Councillor Abbott, and David Crossley. In the body of the room we noticed the Revs. Walter Vercoe, J. Travis, and R. Best; W. Makant, Esq., J.P., Messrs. R. Winder, J. K. Cross, J. Mellor, S. Winkworth, T. Johnson, I. Barrow, and T. Abbott.

After an address by the chairman, Mr. Councillor ABBATT moved, and Mr. JOSEPH CROOK seconded a resolution affirming the principle of the Bill.

Miss RHODA GARRETT supported the resolution. The question was one involving the social, legal, and political liberty of more than one half of the population. Many frivolous arguments were raised against the removal of the electoral disabilities of women. One of these was that nowhere in Scripture was it enjoined that women should have the suffrage, but she considered they should try to act according to the spirit of Christian morality as inculcated in the Bible. She could recollect no distinct utterances with regard to household suffrage, the Licensing Bill, the Alabama Claims, or the Re-organisation of the Army—(laughter and applause)—but she knew that the whole tone and spirit of Bible morality was in favour of anything that had the advancement of truth and justice, and the social and moral welfare of the people. (Applause.) It had been said, when it was proposed to enfranchise working men, that they must first educate them, and then give them the franchise; but the reply was "No, enfranchise them first and they will educate themselves afterwards." Government took more notice of an enfranchised class than of those who did not possess the suffrage, and she would ask whether the educational requirements of the men had been taken more notice of by Parliament before or after the passing of the

Reform Bill of 1867. (Applause.) As to the question whether the majority of the women were Conservatives, possibly they might be, but hitherto she considered they had thought very little about politics. She could not say whether they would vote for Conservatives or Liberals—probably they would develop some entirely new school of politics which would include the virtues and exclude the vices of both parties—(laughter and applause)—and in that case they would all acknowledge that the enfranchisement of women would be a great advantage to the country. The House of Commons should be a fair representation of the people of the country; if, therefore, they excluded more than one half of the population because they entertained this principle or that, the House of Commons, or the Government was no longer a representative one. Still, although she was a Liberal—(applause)—she had a great respect for many Conservatives, and she knew that they numbered amongst their ranks some of their staunchest and most earnest supporters. She entreated them in conclusion not to dismiss the subject with a sneer about women's rights, or think that because a woman cultivated her intelligence and then used it in whatever way she believed to be most useful, that she lost that modesty and purity which she would tell them she valued as highly as men could possibly do. (Applause.)

Miss STUART also supported the resolution, which was put to the meeting and carried with one dissentient.

Mr. DAVID CROSSLEY moved and Mr. J. P. THOMASSON seconded the adoption of a petition to Parliament in favour of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill.

Miss LYDIA BECKER was warmly received, and in the course of an earnest address she said that both of the Bolton members had followed Mr. Jacob Bright into the lobby of the House of Commons. (Applause.) The resolution was adopted with one or two dissentients.—Miss AGNES GARRETT proposed a vote of thanks to the chairman, which was seconded by Mrs. STEPHEN WINKWORTH, and carried with acclamation.—*Abridged from the Bolton Weekly News.*

#### SANDBACH.

A public meeting, at which Miss Stuart, of Balgonie, Fifeshire, delivered an address on the question of women's suffrage, was held in the Literary Institution, on the 8th November. John Latham, Esq., occupied the chair. On the platform were Miss Wolstenholme, and Messrs. H. Latham and B. J. Elmey. The audience, although not very large, was respectable, and listened with great attention to Miss Stuart's able and eloquent address. Resolutions affirming the principle of the representation of women, and adopting petitions to both Houses of Parliament in favour of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill, and memorials to the Hon. Wilbraham Egerton, M.P., and the Earl of Derby, praying that they would support the same, were proposed and supported by Mr. B. J. Elmey and Miss Stuart, Mr. Henry Latham and Miss Wolstenholme, and carried unanimously. A vote of thanks, moved by Mr. J. Latham and supported by G. Percival, Esq., was carried with acclamation. A vote of thanks to the chairman, proposed by Miss Stuart, concluded the meeting.—*Congleton and Macclesfield Mercury, Nov. 23.*

#### HASTINGS.

A meeting in support of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill for the Removal of the Electoral Disabilities of Women, was held in the Castle Assembly Room, on November 15th. Notwithstanding the inclement weather the attendance was large. Major Evans Bell was in the chair, and upon the platform with him were Mrs. H. M. Kingsley, Mrs. Kingsford, Mrs. Fawcett, Mr. John Stewart, the Rev. Mr. Woodin, and Mr. E. J. Hawkes. The Chairman remarked that this was no party question, for whilst it received on one side the support of Sir John Coleridge and Mr. Jacob Bright, it had on the other hand that

of Mr. Eastwick, Mr. Charley, and many others. He pointed out how small a minority of women the extension demanded would admit to the suffrage, and deprecated, as totally unworthy of the 19th century, the argument lately brought forward in the *Pall Mall Gazette* and other papers, that the majority in elections simply carried weight, as a majority, because it represented a preponderance of *physical* strength.—Mrs. Henry Kingsley read a very interesting paper, introducing many instances of the law's cruel injustice to women, upon such points as the right to personal property, to due maintenance, and to the custody of children; and pointed out that these flagrant wrongs were likely to continue until women possessed the only legitimate means of reaching the heart of the Legislature.—Mr. John Stuart moved a resolution for the adoption of a petition to Parliament, to be signed by the chairman in behalf of the meeting, in favour of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill, and also requesting the members for Hastings to vote for the measure.—Mrs. Algernon Kingsford, in seconding the motion, remarked that the reason Mr. Kay-Shuttleworth gave in a letter she had received from him on the subject of the suffrage, was expressed in precisely the same language as that given in another letter by Mr. Brassey. Both members considered that the indirect influence women already exercised amply sufficed for all present purposes. The speaker regretted that indirect influence should be needed, when a straightforward course would be less degrading to both men and women. The resolution was carried almost unanimously, only one hand being held up against it.—Mrs. Ernestine Rose, though not on the platform, lent the weight of her eloquence to the cause, and quite carried away the audience by her skilful combination of sound logic and wit. The second resolution relative to the appointment of a Hastings Committee, was moved by Dr. Hawkes, seconded by the Rev. Mr. Wooding, and carried unanimously. Dr. Cumming remarked (from his seat in the audience), that the question was one simply for time to carry, and another mark of the rapid advance of civilisation.—After a few other allusions to current topics connected with women's questions, the meeting concluded with a cordial vote of thanks to Mrs. Henry Kingsley, and Major Evans Bell; and some influential names were enrolled on the local committee before the proceedings were quite ended. A good report of the meeting appears in the *Hastings and St. Leonards Chronicle*.

#### RYDE, ISLE OF WIGHT.

A meeting was held on November 14th, in the Town Hall, Ryde; C. A. M. Simon, Esq., in the chair. After an address by Miss Craigen, a petition in favour of the Women's Disabilities Removal Bill was adopted, and signed by the chairman on behalf of the meeting. The *Ryde News* in commenting on the lecture, says that the audience appeared thoroughly satisfied with Miss Craigen's view of the subject, and that she was frequently applauded for her eloquent and humorous passages.

#### SANDOWN.

A meeting was held in the Town Hall, Sandown, Isle of Wight, on the 21st of November, when a petition was adopted in favour of the removal of the Electoral Disabilities of Women, and signed by Mr. A. W. Barlow, chairman, on behalf of the meeting.

#### BANBURY.

A large meeting was held at Banbury on November 20th, in favour of removing the political disabilities of women. Mr. Harlock, a magistrate, presided. Speeches were made by Miss Sturge, of Birmingham, and Miss Beedy, of London, and resolutions were passed in favour of the movement.

Miss Beedy has also addressed meetings in Great Marlow and Wallingford.

#### WALES.

##### PONTYPOOL.

On November 18, a successful meeting was held at Pontypool—detailed intelligence respecting which has not reached us—Miss Ashworth and Miss Caroline Biggs addressed the meeting, and petitions in support of the measure were carried.

##### NEWPORT, MONMOUTHSHIRE.

An enthusiastic meeting was held at the Town-hall, under the auspices of the Bristol and West of England Branch of the National Society for promoting Women's Suffrage. Nelson Hewertson, Esq., presided, and the attendance, although good, was not so numerous as was anticipated, mainly owing to the inclemency of the weather. In addition to the ladies and gentlemen comprising the deputation, there were present, amongst others, on the platform, the Revs. H. Oliver, B.A., W. Edwards, Evan Thomas, and a number of ladies.

The CHAIRMAN, in opening the meeting, remarked in his own business transactions he adopted the maxim, "Do unto another as ye would he should do unto you," and if he were to exercise this principle to men and deny it to women he should consider himself unworthy of the name of man. (Hear, hear.) Having read an apology for the non-attendance of the Rev. J. W. Lance, the Chairman called upon Miss Biggs, of London, to move the first resolution which affirmed the principle of the measure.

The Rev. W. EDWARDS seconded the motion, and pointed out the reasons why he so heartily supported the resolution, especially as it did not propose to take the power of voting out of the hands of the men.

Miss LILLAS ASHWORTH supported the resolution, which was carried unanimously.

The Rev. Mr. KNOX having read petitions which it was intended to present to Parliament next session, the Rev. H. OLIVER moved a second resolution to the effect that they be adopted.

The resolution was seconded by Mr. CHEEK.

The Rev. Mr. KNOX, of Bristol, in supporting the resolution, cleared away a misapprehension or two which appeared to have been entertained. He proceeded to advocate warmly the claims of women to the suffrage. If any arguments were before needed to substantiate their claim, he imagined that the talented addresses delivered by Miss Ashworth and Miss Biggs were sufficient to justify their having votes. (Loud cheers.) After adverting to the main features of the Women's Disabilities Bill, Mr. Knox referred in complimentary terms to an article which appeared in the current issue of the *Evening Telegram*, upholding women's suffrage, which he recommended to the careful perusal of the audience. He felt great pleasure in supporting the resolution.

On being put, the motion was carried with acclamation, and the chairman said he should have much pleasure in signing petitions in accordance with the wishes of the assembly.

After the usual complimentary votes of thanks the meeting separated.—*Abridged from the South Wales Evening Telegram.*

##### CARDIFF.

The third of the series of meetings which are being held in South Wales in furtherance of the movement for granting Parliamentary votes to women, took place in the Crown Court, Cardiff, on November 20th. Notwithstanding the Art and Science Meeting in the Assembly Room, and various other meetings in the town, there was a crowded audience, which comprised a large number of ladies. Mr. Richard Cory, junr., presided, and he was supported by Miss Ashworth, of Bath; Miss Biggs, of London; the Rev. W. Knox, of Bristol, the deputation from the Bristol Auxiliary; Miss Jenner, of Wenroo; Mrs. Tilly, and the Rev. H. Chester.

The CHAIRMAN expressed his concurrence in the movement for granting the franchise to women, and referred to the satis-

factory way in which women's votes had worked in municipal elections as an indication of the good effect they would have in Parliamentary elections.

The Rev. H. CHESTER moved a resolution in opposition to the exclusion of women from the franchise.

Miss Biggs, of London, seconded the resolution.

The Rev. W. KNOX, in supporting the resolution, explained that Mr. John Cory was absent on account of illness, but he had expressed his willingness to cordially co-operate with any local society which might be formed in this town. In a vigorous address the speaker examined the question from a biblical point of view, and declared emphatically in favour of granting the franchise to women.

The Rev. J. WAITE, B.A., was called upon to move a resolution in support of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill, adopting petitions in favour of that measure, and asking Colonel Stuart to support it.

Miss ASHWORTH, in seconding the resolution, stated that there were two millions of voters in the kingdom, and if votes were granted to women as they proposed there would be 170,000 women voters. The speaker reviewed the one-sided character of Parliamentary legislation as regards the rights of women, and proceeded to notice some of the objections which had been urged against the Disabilities Bill during the three sessions it had been introduced into the House of Commons. She pointed out at some length the disadvantages which women suffered from not being directly represented, and referred more especially to the endowments for secondary education which had been almost exclusively appropriated for the education of boys, although in very many cases they were intended to be equally enjoyed by girls as well as boys. In looking through the division lists, she had noticed that the Lord-Lieutenant for that county had invariably supported the Disabilities Bill, which the member for their borough had as persistently opposed. She hoped they would use their influence to induce Col. Stuart not to vote against the Bill if they could not obtain his vote in favour of it. The speaker concluded an able and logical speech amidst cheers.

Dr. PRICE, of Treforest (who appeared in his well-known costume of crimson and green), and was received with loud cheers, supported the resolution in a brief speech.

The CHAIRMAN moved a vote of thanks to the lady speakers, which was seconded by Mr. OSBORNE.

A vote of thanks to the Chairman, moved by Mr. KNOX and seconded by Miss Biggs, concluded the proceedings of a very hearty and interesting meeting.—*South Wales Daily News.*

##### NEATH.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.—On November 21, a crowded meeting was held at the Town-hall, to hear addresses from a deputation of the Bristol and West of England branch of the National Society for Promoting Women's Suffrage. The Mayor (Mr. D. Bevan) presided, and he was accompanied on the platform by Mr. J. Richardson, Mr. B. H. Thomas, and the Rev. A. F. Mills, in addition to the ladies and gentlemen forming the deputation. The first resolution (which has already frequently appeared in print) was moved by Mr. Joshua Richardson, and seconded by Miss Biggs in a very eloquent speech, which drew forth frequent outbursts of applause. Miss Ashworth, in a very confident address, supported it, and the resolution was carried by acclamation, there being but one dissentient in the whole assembly. The second resolution, as to adopting a petition, was moved by Mr. H. Lake, and seconded by Mr. B. H. Thomas, Dr. Stephens and Mr. Robert Parsons very ably supporting it. This was also carried by acclamation, the same redoubtable hand being the only one held up against it. A vote of thanks to the Mayor, moved by Miss Biggs, and seconded by Miss Ashworth, brought the somewhat animated meeting to a close.—*South Wales Daily News.*

## SCOTLAND.

## CAMPBELLTON.

A meeting was held on the 8th October, in the Town Hall; Provost Beith occupied the chair, accompanied to the platform by Miss Taylour, Miss M'Laren, and D. M'Dougall, Esq. The Town Hall was well filled. At the close of Miss TAYLOUR's lecture W. HUNTER, jun., Esq., proposed the usual resolution, which was seconded and agreed to, as was one proposed by Mr. M'PHAIL.

Mr. M'PHAIL proposed the next resolution, to the effect that a committee be appointed in this district to forward by every means in their power this movement.

## FALKIRK.

On October 23rd a public meeting was held in Bank-street Chapel, for the purpose of hearing Miss Taylour deliver a lecture on the above subject. Bailie Gentleman presided. He was accompanied to the platform by Miss Taylour, Miss M'Laren, Rev. G. Wade, Mr. J. Wilson, Mr. J. A. Henderson, and Mr. D. Murdoch. There was a pretty large attendance. The usual resolutions were supported by Mr. James Wilson, Mr. Murdoch, Rev. Mr. Wade, and Mr. J. A. Henderson, and unanimously adopted.—*Abridged from the Falkirk Herald.*

## LANARK.

On October 24, in the County Hall, a lecture was delivered by Miss Taylour—Provost Brown occupied the chair, and Miss M'Laren, Edinburgh, sat also beside the chairman. There was a large and very respectable attendance, among whom were—Bailey Harvey, Thomas Watson, Esq., and the Misses Watson, Wheatpark; Mr. and Mrs. Symington, Mr. Laurie, Mrs. H. Marr, and Miss Marr, Mrs. and the Misses M'Gilvary, Misses Johnstone, Westport; Mrs. and Miss Stark, Mrs. Anderson, Miss Galbraith, Misses Someville, Mrs. Robertson; Mr. Cassels, inspector; Mr. Cassels, watchmaker; Messrs. W. & J. Annan, Drs. Ewing and Aitken, Mr. Hilston, Mr. Rough, writer, &c., &c. In a few prefatory remarks, the chairman introduced Miss Taylour, who delivered a lecture full of reasoning and stirring appeals. After which the usual resolutions were carried.—*Abridged from the Lanarkshire Examiner.*

## GIRVAN, ARGYLESHIRE

Miss Taylour addressed a very large and influential meeting on October 28, in the Assembly Rooms, in support of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill, which extends the franchise to all unmarried ladies and widows holding property which would entitle them to vote. Bailie M'Cracken occupied the chair. At the close of the lecture, which was warmly received, resolutions approving of the Bill were unanimously carried, and a large committee was appointed to forward a petition to Parliament for the adoption of the measure.—*Glasgow Herald.*

## LOCHWINNOCH.

A meeting in support of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill for removing the Electoral Disabilities of Women was held in the Town Hall, Lochwinnoch, on October 29. Notwithstanding the extreme inclemency of the weather, there was a considerable audience. After an able lecture by Miss Taylour, late of Belmont, a motion that a ladies' committee to promote the objects advocated in the lecture be appointed, and that the meeting petition in favour of Mr. Bright's Bill, was submitted to the meeting by the Rev. J. Monteath, and was carried. A committee was immediately afterwards formed.—*Glasgow Herald.*

## COATBRIDGE.

A public meeting for the purpose of considering this question was held on November 4th, in the Temperance Hall; John Williams, Esq., in the chair. Owing to the inclemency of the evening, the attendance was much smaller than it would otherwise have been. The chairman, after a few remarks, introduced

Miss Taylour (late of Belmont), who proceeded to deliver a very able and eloquent lecture. At the close of Miss Taylour's lecture, the usual motion, proposed by the Rev. J. Kay, and seconded by the Rev. J. Inglis, was carried.—*Abridged from the Advertiser.*

## NEILSTON, RENFREWSHIRE.

A public meeting was held in the Temperance Hall on Monday evening, October 21st. A. R. Fergusson, Esq., in the chair. Miss Taylour delivered an interesting address on Women's Suffrage. Mr. Alexander Cochran moved, and Mr. William Calder seconded, a resolution approving of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill, and authorising the chairman to sign a petition in name of the meeting in favour of the Bill. It was also resolved to send a memorial to Mr. Bruce, Home Secretary and member for Renfrewshire, asking him to support the Bill when again brought before Parliament.

## HELENSBURGH.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE MEETING.—A public meeting was held in King-street Hall on the evening of November 7th. Councillor Cramb in the chair. Miss Taylour gave an address. Resolutions were moved and seconded in favour of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill, and appointing a committee to promote the objects of the meeting in that neighbourhood. It was also resolved to send a memorial to Mr. Orr Ewing, member for Dumbartonshire, thanking him for the support which he had given to this measure.

## STRACHAN, ARGYLESHIRE.

A public meeting was held in the Free Church School-house on November 8th for the purpose of hearing Miss Taylour give an address on Women's Suffrage. Mr. Duncan Forbes presided. At the close of Miss Taylour's lecture, the Rev. Mr. Macdonald moved a resolution in favour of conferring the suffrage on women who are householders and ratepayers, and authorising the chairman to sign a petition in favour of Mr. Bright's Bill. A committee is being formed to promote the cause of Women's Suffrage in this district of Argyshire.

## BEITH, AYRSHIRE.

There was a large attendance in the Assembly Rooms, on November 5th, to hear an address by Miss Taylour, in explanation and support of the movement for an extension of the political franchise to women. Mr. Love, of Geilsland, occupied the chair, and briefly introduced Miss Taylour. The address was listened to with much interest and attention, and at the close the Rev. Mr. Hall proposed a resolution with effect that a petition in favour of Mr. Jacob Bright's Disabilities Removal Bill should be signed by the chairman on behalf of the meeting and transmitted to Mr. Finnie.—*Abridged from the Western Supplement and Advertiser.*

## ROTHESAY, BUTE.

On November 12th, Miss Taylour delivered a lecture in the Victoria Hall, on the claim of women possessed of the legal qualification to all rights and privileges of citizens. The Rev. Mr. Macfarlane, who presided, said many ladies had a considerable stake in the community, rented houses and paid taxes, and these had a fair claim to the rights of citizens. He had been recently passing through England at the time of the municipal elections there, and he observed that all the placards began with the words, "Ladies and gentlemen," the fact being that women who were ratepayers had votes in municipal matters in England, and why should Scotch ladies not have the same privilege. (Applause.)—After the lecture, a resolution adopting a petition was proposed by Baillie Milroy, seconded by Councillor Bunting, and agreed to.—*Abridged from the Buteman.*

## CORRESPONDENCE.

## THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

To the Editor of the Women's Suffrage Journal.

Dear madam,—The work of all the committees connected with the Women's Suffrage Society is now becoming every year more and more arduous.

By the committees which have been long established the demand for renewed exertions can be well met. Their funds are flourishing, and their programme is arranged so that valuable work can be accomplished by them without much apparent effort. But it is different with the work falling to the share of the Central Committee, a body which has been comparatively recently organised. The members of this committee already belong, for the most part, to local committees, and subscribe to them, and consequently are unable to subscribe also largely to the central.

The ordinary expenses of the Central Committee—such as printing, posting, &c.—are necessarily very large. Nevertheless, we are determined that our other, and more important work shall be thorough and powerful. At the present time there are over fifty boroughs wherein, during the next five months, we intend to hold well-organised meetings. We therefore propose to establish a special "Public Meeting Fund," the proceeds of which will, as its name implies, be devoted exclusively to the organisation of the meetings held under the auspices of the Central Committee.

The Central Committee has no district, properly so-called, and it is willing to assist in organising any meeting in England, Scotland, or Ireland, and in giving the best aid in its power to any local committee in need of assistance. The vigour of the work carried on by other Committees, makes it probable, however, that most of the work done by the Central Committee will be in the midland and south-eastern counties; most of the fifty boroughs mentioned above lie therein.

We shall esteem it a great favour if you will kindly allow a space in your valuable journal for this appeal. It is only necessary to add that donations or subscriptions, of any amount, to the above-named fund will be gratefully received by the treasurer, Henry Hoare, Esq., 37, Fleet-street, E.C., or by your obedient servants,  
CAROLINE ASHURST BIGGS,  
AGNES GARRETT,

Hon. Secs.  
Central Committee of the National Society for Women's Suffrage, 9, Berners-street, W., London.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR PROTECTING  
THE RIGHTS OF WOMEN.

To the Editor of the Women's Suffrage Journal.

Madam,—Will you allow me to correct the error contained in a paragraph in the current number of your *Journal*, announcing that "at a meeting at Darmstadt last month it was resolved to form an International Association for Protecting the Rights of Women, of which the Princess Alice was chosen first president, and several Englishwomen, including Miss Carpenter, Miss Nightingale, Miss Hill, and Miss Merewether, as corresponding members." The association really formed consisted simply of an extension to other countries of an organisation already existing in Germany for bringing a variety of small societies established in different parts of the empire into easy communication, with the purpose of exchanging advice and information, and thus benefiting by each other's experience. An assemblage of delegates from these societies formed the congress which recently met at Darmstadt, under the patronage of Princess Louis of Hesse, who actively interests herself

in the objects they have been formed to promote. These are the care of destitute orphans, the employment of women, the improvement of female education, Kindergartens, and training nurses for the sick.

As personal meetings among members scattered over the whole civilised world, with which it is hoped the area of the new association will be commensurate, would be impracticable, a central office for the exchange of inquiries and information will be established, and as Princess Louis graciously accepted the presidency of the association, this central office will be at Darmstadt.—I am, madam, your obedient servant,

November 6, 1872.

FLORENCE HILL.

THE OBAN MEETING.—We have received a communication from the mover of the amendment at the Oban meeting, in which he denies the correctness of the statement which appeared in the *Journal* of November, that "he made a long speech as to what he thought was involved in giving the suffrage to women, it would put an end to war, capital punishment and flogging, and therefore to all government." Our correspondent says, "the only item of truth in the sentence is that a 'speech' was made, but the reported speech was not it, nor anything like it, but something opposite to it." Had he given us a corrected version of the speech, we would have gladly laid it before our readers; as it is, we must leave them to make out its purport as best they may from his assertion, that it was opposite to that of the impression produced on the mind of the lady who reported it to us.

## Obituary.

MR. J. F. MAGUIRE, M.P.—We record with deep regret the death on November 1st of Mr. John Francis Maguire, senior member for the city of Cork. The deceased gentleman had served 25 years in Parliament, 18 years as member for Dungarvan. He was elected for Cork in 1864. He was a devoted and earnest supporter of the enfranchisement of women. Not only did he vote in favour of the removal of their electoral disabilities on every occasion when the question came before the House of Commons, but in the debate in May last he supported the second reading of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill in a speech of remarkable ability and humour. In his amusing novel—*The Next Generation*—he gives much good sense and thoughtful suggestion, mingled with playfully-coloured pictures of the coming race. His genial disposition endeared him to many who did not coincide in his political views; and one who knew him well says of him that his was the kindest heart that ever beat; its tenderness and chivalry to the weak and the poor was rare in this age of self-interest and sneers.

SIR JOHN BOWRING.—Intelligence has been received of the death of Sir John Bowring, on November 23rd, at Claremont, Exeter. Sir John was born at Exeter in 1792, and was educated at Moreton Hampstead, Devon, and afterwards received the degree of LL.D. from the University of Groningen. He was the author of numerous works on foreign languages and literature, politics, political economy, and finance, and filled various diplomatic and other appointments. He was an earnest supporter of the claims of women to political enfranchisement and intellectual culture. He took a prominent part in the discussion of these subjects at the British Association and the Social Science Congress. Sir John sat in the House of Commons (in the Radical interest) for Kilmarnock from 1835 to 1837, but, on seeking re-election, was defeated. He afterwards twice unsuccessfully contested Blackburn, and also Kirkcaldy, and sat for some time as member for Bolton.

MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR  
WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS RECEIVED DURING NOVEMBER.

	£	s.	d.
Sir Thomas Bazley, Bart., M.P.	5	0	0
Rev. S. Alfred Steintal	5	0	0
Mr. Thos. Chorlton	1	11	6
Mr. W. Lawson	1	1	0
Mr. Peter Spence	1	0	0
Mr. Councillor Harwood	1	0	0
Mrs. Muir	1	0	0
Mr. John Leake, jun.	0	10	6
Miss Malvina Borchardt	0	5	0
Mrs. Addison	0	5	0
Mrs. Plimsant	0	5	0
Miss Corney	0	5	0
Mrs. Winstanley	0	3	0
Mrs. Bleackley	0	2	6
Mr. Alderman Farrer	1	0	0
Mr. Alfred Webb	0	10	3
Mr. Andrew Leighton	0	10	0
Mr. and Mrs. Wilson	0	10	0
Mr. Edwin Fisher	0	5	0
Mrs. Alfred Watts	0	5	0
Miss Pollard	0	5	0
Mr. W. Jennings	0	2	0
	£20	15	9

S. ALFRED STEINTAL.

107, Upper Brook-street, Manchester.

THE PROPERTY OF MARRIED WOMEN.

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH, WESTMINSTER, NOV. 25.  
(Sittings in Banco, before Mr Justice Blackburn, Mr. Justice Mellor, and Mr. Justice Archibald.)

BUSTARD v. TODD.

This case raised an important question under the Married Women's Property Act and the Debtors' Act, which taken together appear to create a difficulty. The Married Women's Property Act provides that a married woman who has separate property may be sued; but says nothing as to the records upon a judgment against her. The Debtors' Act provides that debtors who have means of payment may be committed to prison. In this case a judgment for £300 had been obtained against a married woman, and the question was, what was to be done with it. An application was now made that she should, in the event of non-payment, be committed.

Mr. Prior Goldney appeared for the creditor in support of the application; the husband appeared in person against it.

The Court, after hearing counsel, said the creditor had quite mistaken his course. No doubt there was a great difficulty in carrying out the Married Women's Property Act in this respect; but the remedy, if any, could only be after an examination of the married woman at Judges' Chambers as to her separate property; and a summons for that purpose should be taken out.—Application dismissed.—*Times*.

THE ASSOCIATION OF TRAINED NURSES, 34, Davies-street, Berkeley Square, London, W., provides monthly, medical, surgical, fever, and small pox Nurses; Mental Attendants, male and female, who can be engaged at any hour on application, either personal, per letter, or telegram, to Miss HODGES, Superintendent. N.B.—Some of the Nurses are total abstainers.

FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE, presented at the Annual General Meeting, on November 6th, 1872. In coloured cover, price 6d.

SPEECH of JACOB BRIGHT, Esq., M.P., chairman at the Annual General Meeting Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage, November 6th, 1872. Price 1d.

BIRMINGHAM BRANCH OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.—A CONFERENCE of Delegates from Women's Suffrage Societies, will be held on Friday, December 6th, at 11 a.m., in the Banqueting Room, Masonic Hall, Birmingham. A paper on the past course of the Women's Suffrage movement, will be read by Mrs. A. ARNOLD. A paper on the future of the movement, by Miss BECKER, of Manchester. Discussion on the most effective methods of promoting the cause. A PUBLIC MEETING will be held in the Town Hall, Birmingham, on the evening of the same day. Chair to be taken at half-past seven, by GEORGE DIXON, Esq., M.P. Professor FAWCETT, M.P., Mrs. FAWCETT, Miss BECKER, CHARLES VINCE, Esq., Miss RHODA GARRETT, Miss E. M. SURGE, and others, will take part in the proceedings.

COMMITTEES.

BIRKENHEAD.

Mrs. H. Whittle	Miss Finch
Mrs. F. A. Nosworthy	Miss Emily Cooke
Mrs. R. V. Yates	Rev. William Binns
Mrs. Alexander M'Leod	
Mrs. William Binns, Oak Bank, Oxton Road, <i>President</i> .	
Mrs. Charles Holland, Liscard Vale, <i>Treasurer</i> .	
Mrs. J. G. O'Brien, Fern Nook, Woodchurch Road, <i>Hon. Sec.</i>	

SCOTLAND.

LOCH GILPHEAD, ARGYLESHIRE.

Mr. John Alexander	Mr. D. Mac Brayne
Mr. A. Coulter	Mr. Alexander Reid
Mr. Angus Campbell	Mr. J. Somerville
Mr. J. B. Douglas	R. Stewart
Mr. J. Murray	
Mr. Archibald Mac Ewan, Chief Magistrate, <i>Convener</i> .	
Mr. Thomas Brown, Clydesdale Bank, <i>Hon. Sec.</i>	

NEILSTON, RENFREWSHIRE.

Mr. Alexander Cochran	Mr. W. Calder
Mrs. Cochran	Mrs. Fergusson
Mr. A. R. Fergusson, Clydesdale Bank, <i>Convener</i> .	

FALKIRK.

Mrs. Gentleman	Rev. George Wade
Mrs. J. A. Henderson	Mrs. Wade
Mr. Murdoch	Mr. Wilson
Rev. Dr. Ogilvie	
	Bailie Gentleman, <i>Convener</i> .

LOCHWINNOCH, RENFREWSHIRE.

Miss Connell	Rev. James Monteath
Mr. Connell, Procurator Fiscal.	Miss Smith, <i>Hon. Sec.</i>

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL. Edited by LYDIA E. BECKER.—Volume II., 1871.—In coloured cover, price 1s. 6d., post free, 1s. 10d.

London: Trübner and Co., Paternoster Row.  
Manchester: A. Ireland and Co.

Communications for the Editor and orders for the Journal may be addressed to 28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester. Price post free for one year, One Shilling and Sixpence.

Printed by A. IRELAND & Co., Pall Mall, Manchester, for the MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE, and Published by Messrs. Trübner and Co., Paternoster Row, London.—December 1, 1872.