

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

VOL. II.—No. 17. PUBLISHED MONTHLY.

MANCHESTER, JULY 1, 1871.

PRICE ONE PENNY.

Contents :

Leading Article by the Editor.
English Law for Mothers.
The Law for Married Women.
Married Women's Property :—
List of Subscriptions since February.
Less than Justice for Women.

Women as Civil Servants.
Women and National Education.
Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage :—
Treasurer's Report for June.
School Boards :—Cefn, Clydey.

Public Meetings :—Leeds, Hants and Sussex, Greenwich,
Hackney, Newark, Leicester.
The Women's Disabilities Bill :—
List of Petitions.
Proposed Bazaar and Exhibition.
Woman's Suffrage in America and England.

THE lull which we experience after the termination of the parliamentary campaign for the session should be looked upon as a season for reviewing the advantages we have gained, and for making preparations to improve these advantages with reference to the future. The most effectual method by which our friends can help the cause is by promoting the formation of local committees, especially in those places which return members to the House of Commons. The functions of these committees would be to press the subject on the consideration of the local members when these meet their constituents, and at other convenient times; to hold public meetings for the discussion of the question, and the dissemination of information regarding it; and to promote petitions to Parliament against next session. The work of each local committee would be comparatively light, yet the sum of their exertions would have a powerful influence on the fortunes of the Bill next year.

The necessity for the change which we advocate in the political condition of women becomes strikingly obvious when we consider the present depressed condition of large numbers, if not of the majority of the sex. We have in another page brought forward some typical instances of the hardships women have to endure under the present state of things. The injustice is of two kinds, one is perpetrated under the direct sanction and by express intention of the law; the other is indirectly traceable to its operation as a consequence of legal powers given without adequate security against abuse. To the latter class of sufferers belong the victims of the peculiarly English practice of wife-beating. For the repression of these cruelties, the existing system of legislation is wholly insufficient; yet no Government and no political party thinks it worth while to devote any consideration to the question of its amendment. A wife who has been violently assaulted can have her tormentor imprisoned for a time, but at the end of his period of imprisonment she is delivered over to him again with the strong probability that the latter state of things will be worse than the first.

The law with regard to the maintenance of wives is equally unsatisfactory. In the vast majority of marriages, the wife is expected to be the sole domestic servant of the husband. She performs laborious offices for which, if discharged by any other woman than the one held legally to his service, he would have to pay wages, in addition to maintenance, and should he neglect to provide her with sufficient food and clothing, she has no remedy at law. We have heard of more than one instance in which a working man has habitually spent the whole of his wages on personal indulgences, and required from his wife that she should not only perform household duties but also earn the food for himself and family. We do not maintain that cases of this nature are the rule; all that we say is, that they are by no means uncommon, and that when they do occur, the wife has neither protection nor remedy. The instances we have referred to occurred in Lancashire, and we recently heard from a lady who has a large experience in a manufacturing district in the west of England, that in her neighbourhood a working man commonly considers that he does his share towards the maintenance of his family when he pays the rent of the house, and those who in addition pay the cost of the bread are considered "very generous."

We often hear the class of "self-supporting" women described as if it included only unmarried women, but, in fact, the money-value of the services rendered by the wives of working men is at least equal to the money-value of the maintenance they receive in return. Therefore the vast majority of married women in this country are truly self-supporting, and a large proportion of wives in all classes are not only self-supporting but maintain their husbands and families too.

The laws with regard to illegitimate children are cruelly unjust in casting the most part of the pecuniary burden of their support and the sole responsibility for their lives on the mother, even in cases where there has been legal proof of the identity of the parent who is at once the more guilty of the two, inasmuch as he is usually the

tempter and betrayer, and the best able to bear the burden of the consequences of the wrong. We cannot here indicate the abyss of misery and crime into which thousands of young and very helpless beings are continually swept without hope of rescue. We can only say that human sacrifices—sacrifices of body and soul—are annually exacted from the total number of girls yearly born in England, and that a monster, insatiable and cruel as any recorded in ancient fable, stalks in our midst, and devours his prey in the very heart of our boasted religion and civilisation.

We believe that were a Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the general condition of the women of this country, and into the bearing of existing legislation both in regard to its principles and practice, on that condition, that a revelation would be made which would convince all but the blind devotees of the pedestal or pinnacle theory that women, as a rule, have much harder lives than men; that the struggle for existence is for them more severe, the privations they endure more intense, and that a large proportion of the hardships that beset them could be ameliorated by a more just principle in the laws which determine their relation to men and to the state. Perhaps the most satisfactory composition of such a Commission, in regard to obtaining full and trustworthy information, would be that it should consist solely of women. Women who should be examined as to the conditions of their lives would be likely to speak with least restraint to persons of their own sex; but we think great good would be effected, and some especial advantage be gained by a Commission consisting of equal numbers of women and men. We are not without hopes that some such Commission may be appointed before long.

Of a nature wholly different from the hardships caused by failure in the law to secure its professed object, are those caused by its direct operation. Such are the confiscation of property by marriage, which is still the rule for women in this country; here it is the deliberate design of the law to deprive women of property rights, and the duty of its administrators to enforce the spoliation. The negation of the claims of a mother to any rights or power over her children, is another instance of legal wrong. The natural tie between a mother and child is much stronger than that between a father and child, yet the law recognises the one to the utter exclusion of the other, and arms a father, though he be proved to be an evil and cruel man, with absolute power to tear a child from its mother's arms.

The arbitrary power of the father does not end with his

life. It has been said that a living dog is better than a dead lion, but some decisions in the law courts have recently shown that as regards authority over children a dead father is better than a living mother. A widowed mother has no right to bring up her children in her own religion if that is different from the one which the father professed in his lifetime. Though he may have left them unreservedly in her care, both during his life and at his death, unless he have distinctly directed her to bring them up in her own faith, a stranger may in his name invoke the arm of the law, and divide mother and child in their most sacred and solemn relations.

Two cases of this nature are reported in another column. No comment of ours is needed after the language of the learned judges, whose words in enunciating the law which they reluctantly enforced form its most emphatic condemnation. But we desire to point out that in a case involving relations between father, mother, and child, the law recognises only two parties as having interests which can be considered by the court—the father on the one part, and on the other the child. The mother is legally non-existent. Nothing can override the absolute power of the father but the presumed interest of the child. The judges on one occasion gravely inquired into the opinions and state of mind of a child of nine years old, to see whether its feelings or principles would be shaken by having to change its religion and deny its mother's teaching—but the feelings and interest of the mother herself were put aside, and might not be taken into account. A child of nine years old is allowed by law to have rights, and to have religious opinions, which must be respected. A woman and a mother has neither. She is utterly out of court.

We may be hopeful for the prospect of any earnest effort on the part of women to obtain an amelioration of their condition, when we consider the success which appears to be about to crown the labours of a political agitation which has been mainly carried on by them.

A few years ago, a new system of penal legislation was stealthily introduced. Laws were passed, such as were never before known in this country, for they were made to apply to women only, though the evil which they were ostensibly framed to check was done both by men and women. So deadened was the public conscience on this matter, that the few good men who tried to arouse it, could not make their voices heard by the Legislature, and the Acts were passed in a conspiracy of silence. Then arose a band of noble women, few in numbers, but high in courage and devotion;

ENGLISH LAW FOR MOTHERS.

On April 26th, 1871, in the Court of Chancery, before the Lord Justices of Appeal, the cause of "*Hawksworth v. Hawksworth*," was decided. It was an appeal from a decision of Vice-Chancellor Wickens, as Vice-Chancellor of the Lancaster Chancery Court. The question in dispute was in what religion an infant ward of Court ought to be educated—whether as a Roman Catholic or a Protestant.

The infant is a girl named Catherine Hawksworth, aged about eight years and a half, a daughter of the late Mr Thomas Hawksworth, of Liverpool, who died in March, 1863, when the child was about six months old. The father was a Roman Catholic, the mother was when she married, and still is, a member of the Church of England. The child was baptised according to the rites of the Roman Catholic Church, shortly after her birth. The father gave no directions as to the religion in which the child should be educated. Ever since the father's death she has lived with her mother and has been in the habit of attending the religious services of the Church of England. Some of the relations on the father's side desire that the child should now be brought up in her father's religion.

The Vice-Chancellor had an interview with the child, and came to the conclusion that she had been carefully and well educated. His Honour said that he did not obtain and did not in any way try to elicit any opinion from her as to the question between the Churches, and that if he had thought that the child had been brought up to a keen and premature consciousness of the true bearing and meaning of those questions he should have formed a much less favourable opinion of the mother than he had actually formed. His Honour said, "Were I at liberty to follow my own opinion I should have no hesitation in acceding to Mr. Jackson's earnest argument. To direct that the ward should be brought up in the Roman Catholic faith will be to create a barrier between a widowed mother and her only child, to annul the mother's influence over her daughter on the most important of all the subjects on which it can be exercised, with the almost inevitable effect of weakening it in all others, to introduce a disturbing element into a union which ought to be as close, as warm, and as absolute as any known to man; and, lastly, to inflict the most severe pain on both mother and child. But it is clear that no argument which would recognise any right in the widowed mother to bring up her child in a religion different from the father's can be allowed to weigh with me at all. According to the law of this Court the mother has no such right. The duty of the widowed mother is in general to bring up the child according to the faith which the father professed, even though she utterly disapproves it, and feels that to do so will diminish her influence over the child and cloud the relation between them." For these reasons His Honour directed that the child should be educated in the Roman Catholic faith, and from this decision the mother appealed.

Mr. Dickinson, Q.C., and Mr. Jackson, in support of the appeal, contended that though the general rule of the Court was that a child should be educated in the religious faith of its father, yet exceptions had been allowed. The main thing regarded by the Court was the interest of the child, and if the Court found that the child had imbibed strong impressions in favour of a faith different from that of her father, so that if these impressions were interfered with there would be a danger of unsettling her religious views altogether, then the Court would not do anything to enforce what would otherwise be the rights of the father. At any rate, the Court should have an interview with the child, and ascertain for themselves what the nature of her religious impressions was, as was done by Lords Justices Knight, Bruce, and Turner in "*Stourton v. Stourton*."

and a protest, headed by names of which England is justly proud, rang throughout the land. This was the beginning of a struggle of which the depth can never be known, save to those who endured it. But the issue once laid bare could not long be doubtful, and now seems virtually decided. The Government will have to take up the women's complaint, and bring in a Bill to undo their own work of only two years ago.

If ever there could be a woman's question, distinct from one involving the interest of men, it is this one, and the way in which it has been brought to bear on the seats of members and even the prospects of parties, has gone far to convince men who watch the course of events, that the interests and the wishes of women, as an element in political affairs, must no longer be left out of consideration. Let those who have been labouring for the abrogation of the legislation in question remember that so long as women are unrepresented, their work is but half done, that it is not enough to obtain the repeal of immoral laws, but that it is needful to have safeguards against their reimposition, and that nothing can give to women adequate security against further attempts at legislation in this dangerous direction when the memory of the recent struggle shall have faded, and the workers be laid aside, except the recognition and establishment of their right to a voice in the election of their responsible rulers, and in the enactment of the laws under which they live.

Since the last issue of the *Journal* the University Tests Bill has become law. It is instructive to compare the fortunes of this Bill with those of the Married Women's Property Bill. Both were framed to establish a just principle and to remove a practical grievance. In one case the grievance though great was not absolutely ruinous to the subjects of it. Though in a certain sense deprived of earnings for which they had laboured, they were not despoiled of future earnings. In the other case the sufferers were under lifelong disability to earn or possess anything. The first class of aggrieved persons had votes, the last had none. Both Bills were passed by the House of Commons, and returned from the Lords with the principle destroyed. In the Bill which concerned the class that had the suffrage, the representatives of the people quietly restored the principle and sent it back to the Lords, who as quietly accepted it. In the Bill which concerned the unrepresented class, the House of Commons quietly acquiesced in the destruction of the measure they had sanctioned, and passed the substitute sent from the Lords without a word of dissent. It was not worth while insisting on the maintenance of a principle which merely concerned the welfare of a few millions of persons who could not vote.

(8 *De G. M. and G.*, 760) in the case of a child a little more than nine years old, the result of which was that they allowed the child to be educated in the faith of the mother, who was a Protestant, instead of that of the deceased father, who had been a Roman Catholic.

Lord Justice James was of opinion that the Vice-Chancellor had arrived at a right conclusion, and that he was also right in the manner in which he had dealt with the infant in the interview which he had with her. His Lordship did not think it proper to pursue any further an investigation into the state of the infant's mind. In this case the child was eight-and-a-half years old. Her father was a Roman Catholic, and shortly before his death he had her baptised in a Roman Catholic church, with Roman Catholic sponsors. His other children by a former wife were all brought up in the Roman Catholic faith. There was no trace of indifference on the part of the father as to the religious education of the child. There was nothing to show that he would have consented to her being brought up as a Protestant. The rule of this Court was that all persons who had the charge of a child after its father's death should have regard to the religion of the father in their dealings with the child. Under ordinary circumstances it was the duty of a guardian and it was the duty of this Court to see that the child was brought up in the religion of the father. This child had been brought up by a Protestant mother, and had received such religious impressions as a Christian mother would produce upon the mind of a carefully-educated Christian child; and the Vice-Chancellor was of opinion that she had not been inducted into those matters of religious controversy between Protestants and Roman Catholics of which it was very difficult that a child of her age should have any understanding. The child had now arrived at an age at which it was of importance that her religious education should be attended to, and the question was what form of religion should be adopted. His Lordship was of opinion that no other form of religion could be adopted than that of the father. There had no doubt been cases in which the impressions which had been made upon a child's mind were such that the Court found that any attempt to alter them would involve great danger to the child's religious faith. But there never had been any case in which the Court had inquired into the religious impressions of a child only eight and a half years old. That course was carried to its extreme limit in the case of "*Stourton v. Stourton*," and his Lordship did not wish to carry it any further. In that case the child had been prematurely induced by a proselytising mother into matters of religious controversy. His Lordship said that he for one should be very unwilling to do anything to encourage any person to begin the work of proselytising in the case of children of such tender age, when it would be well that they should be kept entirely free from those religious controversies with which the outer world was too much occupied. In the present case nothing of that kind had occurred. The child had only received religious impressions, and had been taught her religious duties by her mother, and there would be nothing to disturb those impressions in now adding to them the peculiar doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church. The mother has had the charge of the child up to the time when her regular religious instruction ought to commence, and the Court ought now to direct that she be brought up and educated as a member of the Roman Catholic Church, as she could not have acquired any peculiar religious impressions which would render this course improper.

Lord Justice Mellish was entirely of the same opinion. He agreed in the conclusion of the Vice-Chancellor and in the manner in which he had conducted the case. He agreed also that the case of "*Stourton v. Stourton*" had carried the inquiry into

the religious opinions of a child as far as it ought to be carried. In this case, however, the child was younger than that. It was very desirable that the rule of law applicable to these cases should be clearly laid down. That rule was, that unless there existed some strong reason in the interest of the child rendering it undesirable, a child ought to be brought up in the religion of his father. Was there any such reason in the present case? His lordship could quite conceive a difference of opinion as to the propriety of this rule of law in a case where, the parents being of different religions, the father died first without giving any directions as to the religious education of his child. But this court could not alter the rule of law, and if it were to reverse the decision of the Vice-Chancellor in the present case, it must do so upon the ground that the child had received such strong impressions with regard to the doctrines of a particular faith that it would be undesirable to alter the system of its religious education. But if the Court were to have regard to the religious opinions of a child of such tender age, it must do so in whatever way it had acquired those opinions, even in a case where the child had been stolen away for the purpose of being made a proselyte. But his Lordship could not think that the religious opinions of a child of such tender years as eight and a-half were ever so matured that they ought to be attended to by the Court. The Vice-Chancellor saw this child, and inquired into her general state of education, and he came to the conclusion, in which his Lordship concurred, that it would be undesirable to go into the question whether she had acquired any strong impressions with regard to the matters of difference between the two Churches. The appeal would be dismissed with costs.

RELIGION OF MINORS.—A curious case was decided, on June 3, by the Irish Lord Chancellor, Lord O'Hagan. An application had been made by the guardians of five minors that they should be brought up in the Roman Catholic religion. The minors were the children of a Roman Catholic father and a Protestant mother. The father is dead. They are all boys. Edward, the eldest son, was born on the 26th February, 1856; Frank Henry, born 26th November, 1858; William, born 26th July, 1860; Patrick Edgar, born 22nd March, 1862; and Charles James, born 21st July, 1864. The children, it appeared, had been baptised Roman Catholics; but their father, during a portion of his life, seems to have allowed them to be instructed and brought up in the Protestant religion. Returning to Ireland from Australia, shortly before his death, his religious feelings appeared to have been aroused, and, although in his will he simply directed the children to be brought up "piously and religiously," the Lord Chancellor held that he meant them to be Roman Catholics. But his Lordship added, the Court, although it usually ordered that children should be brought up in the religion of their father, recognised the principle that circumstances might arise which would render such a course injurious to the religious interests of the children. He had seen the children, and he found the two younger had formed no definite religious opinions, and therefore, in their case, the father's opinions must prevail. The other three had unquestionably formed Protestant opinions. Their mother, having been left to act as she pleased, had exercised control over them from their birth, and they had formed opinions adverse to Roman Catholicism. When the religious principles of the children were settled, the Court could not allow them to be shaken to their foundation by interfering with them or endeavouring to force another religion upon them. As to the apparent hardship of separating the children, all he could say was that he had no discretion, the law being imperative.

THE LAW FOR MARRIED WOMEN.

The legal position of married women in this country has been compared to that of slaves in the Southern States of America before the war of emancipation. At that period slaves were sometimes hired for the performance of certain services, the contract being made with the owner, who alone had a legal right to dispose of the services of the slave, and not with the slave himself. English wives are in this respect in a similar position to negro slaves. Anyone who wishes to secure the professional services of a married lady must make the contract with her owner, and not with herself. In the Court of Exchequer, on the 24th of May last, a judgment was given in reference to an action brought against the husband of the celebrated pianiste, Madame Arabella Goddard, for breach of a contract that she should perform at a certain pianoforte recital. The defence was that at the time Madame Goddard was too ill to attend and play, and this was held to be sufficient, therefore the husband gained the day. Madame Arabella Goddard may be able to execute a sonata of Beethoven, but she is not, by the laws of her country, able to execute a contract for its performance. Her husband may not be able to play the sonata, but he alone is recognised by law as the party responsible for its being played.

A further illustration of the position of married women in this respect is furnished by the following letters which appeared in the *Daily News* in June, 1871. So far as we have seen no one has come forward to answer the implied question of the ladies, as to how far they are protected by the law in the exercise of their profession:—

To the Editor of the *Daily News*.

Sir,—I am a teacher of music. For years I have supported myself, my children, and—to a great extent—my husband. I have long been anxious to put by some of my earnings, but I have been unable to do so because my husband claimed them as his own. When the law for the protection of the property of married women passed last year, I was under the impression that I should be able to save money for my children. My husband, however, tells me that I cannot teach music without his consent, and that this consent he will withdraw if I do not hand over to him every week all I receive for my lessons. I know nothing of law, but if this be law I do not exactly see how my earnings are protected.—Your obedient servant,
A MUSIC MISTRESS.

To the Editor of the *Daily News*.

Sir,—A few days ago a letter appeared in the *Daily News* from a Music Mistress, stating that she was obliged to hand over to her husband all her earnings, because he threatened her, if she refused to do so, to forbid her to pursue her profession. My case is somewhat similar. I am an actress. Some years ago I married a solicitor, and it was understood that I was to leave the stage. About a fortnight after my marriage, my solicitor made his appearance at our home very drunk. This he continued to do two or three times a week during the period that I resided with him in the country; but, drunk or sober, seldom a day passed without his ill-treating me whenever no witness was by. I had saved up a few hundred pounds before my marriage; he took them to "invest for me." As soon as they were spent, he told me that he could not afford to keep me in idleness—which indeed was true, for he had not many clients—and that I must return to the stage. I was glad to do so, as I found that I had made a bad thing of domestic bliss, and I obtained an engagement at a London theatre. My husband remained in the country, and occasionally came up to my lodgings in London. As long as he confined himself to taking

all the money he could from me, and varying the monotony of our tête-à-têtes by shaking me and calling me names, I submitted to my fate, for he said that he knew the law, and that I and everything I had belonged to him. At length one night he tried to strangle me, and the next morning I ran away to the house of a friend. My husband sold my furniture, and went off to the country with my clothes. I, having nothing to live on but my profession, have since then continued to act; but I am subjected to endless persecutions. Every now and then my husband makes his appearance at the theatre, and reviles me. He now says that he intends to obtain an injunction against my acting. I have been to my lawyers—they are two, partners. One says that I can act, the other says that I cannot act, and that if I do, my salary must go to my husband. What, sir, am I to do? I have a child who is dependent upon me; the few clients which my husband had have deserted him and he is penniless. Must I return to him to starve and to be beaten? I am not a member of a woman's rights convention; I do not want a vote, but I do think it hard that laws for the protection of the property of married women's earnings are made which do not protect mine, and that I am not to be allowed honestly to earn my living in peace and quiet.—Your obedient servant,
June 20. AN ACTRESS.

A few days ago Mr. B. J. Abbott, solicitor, applied to Mr. Newton, at the Worship-street Police-court, on behalf of a lady named Counsel, for a protection order. About the end of the year 1869, or the beginning of 1870, the applicant married in Australia a person named Counsel. She was then possessed of personal and other property to a considerable extent, and gave her husband a cheque for £1,000 to purchase a house. He made acquaintance with other men, and within a few days afterwards he sailed from Australia for this country, having first cashed the cheque for gold, and brought over more than £900 with him. On the voyage the greater part of the money was stolen by one of Counsel's companions. Mrs. Counsel having found that her husband had deserted her, came to this country by overland route, and waited the arrival of the ship, and having found that the money had been stolen, she communicated with the police, and the result was the apprehension of the right man, who was subsequently convicted at the Central Criminal Court, and the recovery of over £600 of the money. The applicant, Mrs. Counsel, and her husband lived together for a short time in this country, but then he again left her. She had received money since her residence in this country, and her husband had gone to her lodgings, taken it away from her, and deprived her also of all her clothes except what she was wearing. He did not support her, and did not work. She was now expecting a remittance of about £4,000 from Australia, and was afraid that unless protected her husband would come again and deprive her of all her possession.—Mr. Abbott having pointed out to the magistrate that the Married Woman's Property Act only protected her property to the extent of £200, Mr. Newton granted the protection order.—*Daily News*, June 1st.

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY COMMITTEE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS RECEIVED SINCE FEBRUARY, 1871.	
Miss Jessie Boucherett.....	£5 0 0
Mr. Wood.....	0 5 6
Miss Hacking.....	0 5 0
Mr. Samuel Morley, M.P.....	25 0 0
	£30 10 6

LYDIA E. BECKER, TREASURER.

28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester.
June 30, 1871.

LESS THAN JUSTICE FOR WOMEN.

"There are various important particulars in which women obtain less than justice under social arrangements."—*Speech of Mr. Gladstone on Women's Disabilities Bill.*

Every daily newspaper furnishes illustrations of this remark. The following appears in the *Times*:—"At Marlborough-street, George Finley, a carpenter, was charged with ill-using his wife, Mary Finley. The complainant said that her husband struck her on the head, having been prevented from throwing the kettle at her, which he took off the fire for that purpose. He worked for several good firms, and could earn £4 a week. On the day when she was assaulted she had asked him for a little money to get food for herself and children. He reluctantly threw down sixpence, and when she sent for twopennyworth of bullock's liver he seized the pan and flung it down. Poole, the assistant gaoler, said the woman was respectably conducted, and from what he knew of the parties it was a very bad case. Mrs. Camp said she had frequently given the complainant food. She believed the complainant would have died of cold but for the assistance she gave her.

Another newspaper cutting runs thus:—

"MURDEROUS ATTACK UPON A WIFE AT DUDLEY.—At the Dudley Police Court, John Onions, a collier, was charged with an aggravated assault on his wife, Susannah, with intent to inflict grievous bodily harm. The case was one of peculiar barbarity. After keeping the poor woman without the means of subsistence for more than a month, the prisoner met her in the street, and when she asked for a penny for milk for their child, he, in the presence of two witnesses, knocked her down with his fist, kicked her about the head and face with his heavy boots, punched her whilst on the floor, and finally dragged her up by the hair and flung her, bleeding and insensible, against a pit hovel. The workhouse surgeon's certificate was to the effect that the woman was seriously injured, and would be unable to attend for some time. The prisoner begged hard for bail, but he was remanded to the cells for a week."

Now the point to which we desire to call special attention in these cases is—not the assault,—wife-beating is so common that it has come to be regarded as a natural condition of things, calling for no special remark nor interference—but the state of the law which permits the wife of a man who can earn £4 a week to be dependent on the charity of a neighbour for the food and fire needful to keep body and soul together. Observe, she asked her husband for money to buy food—he reluctantly threw down sixpence—and when she had obtained her twopennyworth of cat's meat, he destroyed it.

In the second case the woman had been kept without means of subsistence for a month, and had to ask her husband for a penny for milk for their child. For this deprivation the wife has no remedy at English law. She can only ask, she cannot claim from her husband money to buy food.

The magistrate could lock up her husband for beating her, but he could do nothing to him for starving her so long as he did not starve her to death. He could neither punish him for neglecting to supply her with food and fire, nor make an order on him to provide for her future necessities. By reason of this cruel defect in the law, vast numbers of women and children are suffering the pangs of hunger, because it is left to the absolute will and pleasure of a married man to determine whether his earnings shall go to the support of his family or to the public-house.

What is an injury "bad enough" to justify a wife in appealing for protection from her husband? The wife of a Birmingham man lately told a lady that she did not consider it necessary to do anything of the kind, when he only twisted his left hand in

her hair, and hammered her eyes and face with his fist, kicking her body meanwhile with his heavy boots! She had several times been obliged to seek refuge against him before, and while he was in prison she was able to work steadily for her children. Now he has committed another assault, worse than the fisticuffs and kicks, and she has been compelled to appeal to justice, and the husband will spend the ensuing six months in prison. But when those months are over, what is to prevent him from returning to the charge? Very probably the next we shall hear of him will be that he is arrested on the charge of wife-murder. The wretched wife—who is known to be a particularly hard-working, sober woman—does not conceal that she fears this will be the end. Why, then, does she not get a divorce from the brute? It appears that, even if she were permitted to sue *in forma pauperis*, the cost of a suit would not be less than £40—a sum, of course, utterly out of the poor soul's reach. A benevolent lady, well-known in Birmingham for labours of charity, writes to the *Daily Post* to suggest a contribution of £8 or £10 to remove the poor woman and her children where the gaol-bird will not be able to find them.—*Echo.*

Sir John Lubbock, in his work on the "Origin of Civilisation and the Primitive Condition of Man," remarks: "The position of women in Australia seems indeed to be wretched in the extreme. They are treated with the utmost brutality, beaten and speared in the limbs on the most trivial provocation."

AN AGREEABLE COMPARISON.—In an action touching the liabilities of stockbrokers, recently heard in the Court of Common Pleas, the Lord Chief Justice, in reply to an allegation on the part of the defendant that if the name of an infant had been *bona fide* given, and had not been objected to within ten days, the jobber was free from liability by the usage of the Stock Exchange, said—"Even if he had given the name of a married woman or a lunatic? Could it be that the Stock Exchange was desirous of establishing such a usage as that? If so, the effect would be that the confidence which the public now had in gentlemen upon the Stock Exchange would cease to exist." Married women may learn from this, that as regards capacity for business, they are in the eye of the law no better than lunatics.

We regret to have to record the death, at the age of 56, of Mr. William Pollard-Urquhart, M.P. for the county of Westmeath. He entered Parliament in the Liberal interest in 1852. At the general election of 1857 he was again returned for Westmeath, and retained his seat till his death. He voted with Mr. Mill, in 1867, for the enfranchisement of women, and in 1870 recorded his vote for the Women's Disabilities Bill.

WOMEN JURORS.—At the close of the term of the Court at Laramie, Wyoming, at which some women jurors served, Judge Howe expressed the thanks of the community to the jury for their honest, impartial, and capable discharge of their duties, and added that he was prepared to indorse fully and unqualifiedly the excellent results that spring from the influence and presence of women in the jury-box; that he had not been able, with the closest observation, to detect the least objection or unfitness in woman to serve in that capacity, and he had reason to believe that the introduction of her refining and humanising influence marked a new and improved epoch in the administration of justice.—*Times.*

The "Social and Political Dependence of Women," by Mr. Charles Anthony, jun., has just appeared in an Italian edition. The book is in its fourth edition in England, and there is an American edition published by Messrs. Spenser and Co., of Boston. It has also been translated into French by M. Auguste Lévy; and a German edition is in the press, the issue of which recent events have postponed for a time.

WOMEN AS CIVIL SERVANTS.

Mr. F. J. Scudamore, in his report to the Postmaster-General on the re-organisation of the telegraphic system of the United Kingdom, gives the following account of the women employed at the central station. The staff employed in Telegraph-street during the day—that is, from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m.—is mainly, though not entirely, a female staff. Mr. Scudamore says that women have the essential qualifications of quickness of eye and ear, and delicacy of touch, are more patient than men during long confinement to one place, and take more kindly to sedentary employment; that the wages which will draw men from but an inferior class will draw women from a superior class, and hence they will generally write better than the former, and spell more correctly; and that they are less disposed than men to combine for the purpose of extorting higher wages. Where the staff is mixed, the female clerks raise the tone of the whole staff. Civil servants expect their remuneration to increase with their years of service, even though, from the nature of their employment, they can be of no more use or value in the twentieth than in the fifth year of service, but women will retire for the purpose of getting married as soon as they have the chance, and only those will return to the service whose married life is less fortunate than they hoped. Mr. Scudamore concludes that if we place an equal number of females and males on the same ascending scale of pay, the aggregate pay to the females will be less than that to the males; and there will be fewer females than males on the pension list. The department provides tea and coffee and bread and butter morning and evening for the female clerks in Telegraph-street, and also provides them with fuel, attendance, and culinary utensils, linen and crockery, &c.; but they provide their own dinner. Their conduct, under circumstances of great pressure, and occasionally of some annoyance, "has been beyond all praise." At Michaelmas last there were 901 female clerks in the employment of the Telegraph department; 820 were operators, and 81 counter clerks.

We read in the *Gazette* of St. Petersburg:—"The director of the third section of the private Chancellery of the Emperor has informed the Chief of the police, that after examination, by the Council of Ministers in presence of the Emperor, on the question of admission of women to government offices, his Majesty judging it necessary to fix the sphere in which women may be employed resolved, on 14th January last:—1st. That the classes specially organised for the study of midwifery by women, will be increased in number and perfection by all possible means, and that every facility will be given in order to allow a larger attendance, so as to permit the largest possible number of women to find employment as midwives in every part of the empire.—2nd. In consideration of the services rendered by Sisters of Mercy, in hospitals, women shall be authorised to fill the post of vaccinators of nurses, as also that of apothecary in hospitals for women.—3rd. Women shall be encouraged to pursue the profession of education, where they already fulfil the functions of teachers in the primary schools, and in the lower classes of the colleges for women. The Minister of Public Instruction shall be authorised to extend their sphere in this branch as far as he judges possible.—4th. Women shall be admitted (a) in the telegraphic service as telegraphers and signalers, but only in the proportion fixed by the Minister of the Interior, to the number of servants, (b) as clerks in the civil service.—5th. Women shall not be allowed to hold such pension offices as are in the gift of the state, or those to be had by election.—6th. The above resolutions shall be notified to all the ministers and heads of service for execution accordingly. All movements relative to this question which are in discussion in the Ministry of the Interior, or other offices, shall be considered terminated."—*French Newspaper.*

WOMEN AND NATIONAL EDUCATION.

A deputation of ladies interested in the cause of education waited on Mr. Forster, on May 4, at Whitehall, and presented a memorial. The deputation was introduced by Mr. Jacob Bright, M.P., and consisted of the following ladies: Mrs. Butler, President of the North of England Council for Promoting the Higher Education of Women; Mrs. Jacob Bright; Miss Ashworth, member of the Bath School Board; Miss Becker, member of the Manchester School Board; Miss Isabella Todd, and Miss Wolstenholme. The subjects particularly brought under the notice of the Vice-President of the Council were the proposed lowering of the standard of examination for girls in the Privy Council schools, the objections to compulsory sewing, and the appointment of women as inspectors of schools.

On May 17 a similar deputation interested in Irish educational affairs, waited on the Marquis of Hartington, Chief Secretary for Ireland, at his official residence. The deputation consisted of Mrs. Hare, Miss Anne F. Ashworth, Miss Lillias S. Ashworth, Miss Kirkpatrick, Miss Davidson, and Miss Tod. The ladies were introduced by Mr. William Johnston, M.P. for Belfast. They pressed upon the Chief Secretary the desirability of appointing women as Inspectors of National Schools, and of taking steps to open the faculties of the Queen's Colleges to women. They also asked for an inquiry into the state of education among girls of the upper and middle classes in Ireland, similar to that made in England under the Schools Inquiry Commission. Lord Hartington promised that the subject should receive consideration. He said that the Government was under a sort of implied pledge to deal with the question of Irish education, and that any memorial or other expression of opinion on the part of Irish ladies which should be sent to him should receive the most careful consideration, not only from himself, but from other members of the Government.

TREASURER'S REPORT FOR JUNE, 1871.

SUBSCRIPTIONS RECEIVED DURING THE MONTH.	
A Friend, per Miss Jolley.....	£0 10 0
Miss Thomas.....	0 5 0
Mr. J. H. Hodges.....	0 5 0
Mr. Clair J. Grece.....	0 10 0
Mrs. B. Blackburn.....	0 2 6
Mrs. Dehersant.....	0 10 0
Mrs. P. A. Hanrott.....	2 0 0
Rev. J. Page Hopps.....	0 2 6
Miss J. Boucherett.....	5 0 0
Mr. P. Goldschmidt (for Bazaar).....	5 0 0
Mrs. H. Dawson.....	0 2 6
Mrs. M. Davies.....	0 2 6
Miss M. A. Brown.....	0 2 6
	£14 12 6

S. ALFRED STEINTHAL.

The Treasurer of the Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage respectfully asks for aid in carrying on the operations of the society. The rejection of the Bill this session compels the committee to undertake more active operations in the country, and these cannot be successfully carried on without a large increase in the subscription list. The small amount at the committee's disposal has been most economically applied, but very essential work will remain undone if funds are not forthcoming; while so great progress has been already attained that the committee are sanguine of success, if they could command the requisite means.

Cheques and Post Office Orders should be made payable to the Treasurer, 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. 107, Upper Brook-street, Manchester, July 1st, 1871.

Table of petitions for women's suffrage, April 19-26. Includes entries for Ruth Holme, Newark, Stirling, Chelsea, Deal, Coupar Angus, Selkirk, Peterborough, Salford, Brighton, Blue Pits, Evesham, Berwickshire, Stockport, Westminster, Henry Browne, Deptford, Saint Asaph, Alloa, Tiverton, Keynsham, West Bromwich, Glasgow, Kintore, Burnley, Melrose, Salford, Eccles, Laswatt, Rhyll, Dumfries, Louisa Corney, Aberdeen, Finsbury, Waltham, North and South Bersted, Southwark, Manchester (New Cross), Manchester (St. George's Ward), Helensburgh, Emma Jane Daley, Sarah Ann Daley, Bridge of Allan, Perth, Salisbury, Stoke-upon-Trent, Falkirk, Edgbaston, Burnley, Merthyr Tydfil, Kensington, Burslem, Kildgrove.

Table of petitions for women's suffrage, April 26-May 1. Includes entries for Dundee, Canterbury, Rusholme, Greenock, Coventry, Dumfries, Wilmslow, Lambeth, Cardiff and Bonvilstone, Stonehaven, Blairgowrie, H. W. Beech, Devonport, Clackmannanshire, Darlington, North Wootton, Forfar, Manchester, Dublin, Rathmines, Street, Manchester (School Board), Kingstown, Bath, Colonel W. E. Evans, Tranent, Glasgow, Biggar, Hackney, Liskeard, Woolastone, Southwark, Calder Bridge, Shrewsbury, West Kent, Hawick, Ipswich, Manchester (Ardwick Ward), Cirencester, Salford, Cupar, Cupar, Hendon, Bourton-on-the-Hill, Dalkeith, Bognor, Hamilton, Edinburgh, Tonbridge, Cefn, Coupar Angus, Gloucester, Tower Hamlets, Thurso, Girvan, Broadway, Glasgow, Derby, Montrose, Brechin, Manchester, Annie P. Lane, Manchester, Stretford, New Castle-town, Manchester (St. Luke's Ward), Cheetham Hill, Wootton Bassett.

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

Table of petitions for women's suffrage, May 1-2. Includes entries for Staleybridge, Irvine, North Berwick, Jedburgh, Dirleton and Prestonpans, Haddington, Falmouth, Paisley, Janet Murdie, Jane Mason, Andover, Edgeware and Little Stanmore, Wishaw, Gateshead, Dinas Maudebury, Cambridge (Fellows of Colleges and Graduates of the University), Croydon, Wigan, Bridgewater, Portobello, Portobello, Edinburgh, Bannockburn, Dundee, Joseph Young, New Quay, Galashiels, Denbigh, Wigan, Northampton, Hackney, Rutherglen, Manchester (New Cross Ward), Manchester (Ardwick Ward), Manchester (Women of), Elgin, Ingatestone, Woolwich, Plumstead, Charlton, Greenwich, Westminster, Rawtenstall, Taunton, Carlisle, Marylebone, Henry Jerson, Hatton Garden, Edinburgh, Dalkeith, Bristol, Stoke-upon-Trent, Blackheath and Greenwich, Aberdeen.

Table of petitions for women's suffrage, May 2. Includes entries for Cowbridge, Grantham, Bromborough, Cambridge (Fellows of Colleges and Undergraduates of the University), Kilmarnock, Ironbridge, London (Liverpool, Manchester, and other places), Manchester (National Society for Women's Suffrage), Manchester (Inhabitants of), Manchester (St John's Ward), Hereford, Ardwick, Manchester (St. Luke's Ward), Stalybridge, Bollington and others, Leeds, Worthing, Salford, Preston, Ardrossan and Saltcoats, Bath, Birmingham, C. S. Bulcning, Christchurch, Tavistock, Retford, Great Grimsby, Ravensthorpe, Bridport, Midhurst, Plymouth, Dunkeld, Liverpool, Dewsbury, Metropolis, Balbriggan, Leicester, Metropolis, Chelsea, Windsor, Charlotte A. M. Burbury, Greenwich, J. E. Bruce, Elizabeth Blackwell, White Cross Street, Hastings, Chichester, King's Lynn, Hastings, Trowbridge, Barrhead, Exeter, Marylebone, Southsea.

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

May	4	Calae, Inhabitants of	Lord E. Fitzmaurice	89
"	4	Northampton, Meeting at ; Members of the Corporation of, William Shoosmith, town clerk... ..	Mr. Gilpin ...	1
"	4	Woolwich, Meeting at ; Eliza Mary King, president... ..	Mr. W. E. Gladstone	1
"	4	Peebles, Inhabitants of	Sir G. Montgomery	44
"	4	Cheltenham, "	Mr. B. Samuelson	870
"	4	Shadwell, Limehouse, &c.		54
"	4	Sheffield, Inhabitants of		399
"	4	Dunoon, "		374
"	5	Lincoln, Meeting at ; James Bell, chairman	Mr. Palmer ...	1
"	8	Leith, Inhabitants of... ..	Mr. Macfie ...	214
"	9	Manchester, "	Mr. Jacob Bright	52
"	9	Newcastle-on-Tyne, Municipal Corporation of	Mr. Headlam ...	Seal.
"	9	Chichester, Inhabitants of	Lord G. Lennox	200
"	9	Lincoln, "	Mr. Palmer ...	862
"	9	Grantham, "	Mr. F. Tollemache	16
"	9	Framlingham, "		88
"	9	Wandsworth, "		84
"	9	Framlingham, Meeting at ; Jas. Larnier, chairman... ..		1
"	11	South Shields, Inhabitants of... ..	Mr. Jacob Bright	30
"	15	Greenwich, Meeting at ; W. Bennet, chairman	Mr. W. E. Gladstone	1
"	16	Newcastle-under-Lyne	Mr. Allen ...	23
"	18	Wick, Inhabitants of	Mr. Loch ...	116
"	19	Nairn, "	Mr. Mackintosh .	61
June	9	Newark-on-Trent, Meeting at ; Josiah Mellor, M.A., chairman	Mr. Bristowe ...	1

In addition to those enumerated above, there have been presented 162 petitions from 162 individual women householders.

Total number of Petitions 619—Signatures 186,889

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

The following summary of petitions for Women's Suffrage, presented to the House of Commons during the session of 1871, is taken from the twenty-sixth Parliamentary report :—

	No. of Petitions signed Officially	Total No. of Petitions	Total No. of Signatures
Women's Disabilities Bill—Against ..	1	1	1
" " " In favour	73	619	186,889

PROPOSED BAZAAR AND EXHIBITION.

The Executive Committee of the Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage have pleasure in announcing that the proposed bazaar has now become unnecessary. A few friends of the movement, feeling desirous to relieve the committee from the labour and responsibility of the undertaking, and of setting free their energies for more direct work, have generously come forward to guarantee the amount of £500 which the committee hoped to raise by the bazaar.

The committee desire here to return their earnest thanks to these generous friends, and also to those who have already sent or are preparing contributions. They beg to assure the latter that their labours will not be thrown away. The articles received will be disposed of for the benefit of the funds of the society in some manner to be determined by the executive committee.

WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE IN AMERICA AND ENGLAND.—A great meeting of the Woman's Suffrage Convention, held at Boston, on the 30th ult. The convention was addressed by Mrs. Blackwell, Mr. Charles W. Slack, Grace Greenwood, Margaret Campbell, Amasa Walker, Lucretia Mott, and Mrs. Margaret Lucas, of England, sister of John Bright. Miss Greenwood contended for the admission of women to the pulpit. Mrs. Lucas in her speech as reported by the *New York Tribune*, spoke of what the friends of woman suffrage were doing in England. During the present session of Parliament the bill to extend the right of suffrage to women was brought before the House of Commons, and they considered that they had made very great progress since the last year in having it brought forward. The women of England, she said, had laboured hard since spring to advance the cause, feeling that this was just the crisis of the movement. They were not so far advanced as their sisters in America, as they did not ask as yet for universal suffrage, but for household suffrage only, though several gentlemen contended that married women had equal rights with those not married, and that suffrage should be extended to all. However, it was a mere question of time. The women there, as here, were slandered by their opponents, and several members of Parliament opposed them because they were afraid they would ask for a seat in the House of Commons. That question would be left to a future generation, for Englishwomen were not quite ready for that yet. The fact was, the women were thoroughly roused on the question of suffrage ; they were fighting a great fight on the licensing of vice, and she hoped American women would keep their eyes open on this question, for it was the ground-work of all their misery. Then came the question of temperance—a great one truly—which they would have to handle when they got the right to vote. The Woman's Property Bill had also made progress in Great Britain. After several other speeches had been made, a series of resolutions was discussed demanding suffrage as a right ; denouncing the Legislatures of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Vermont for refusing to consider the petitions for woman suffrage without assigning reasons therefor ; declaring that the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Society will never disband until their end is attained ; and that the movement had nothing to do with special social theories, the attempt to associate the cause with the doctrines of free love, and to hold it responsible for the crimes and follies of individuals being an outrage on common sense and decency, and an insult to the virtue and intelligence of American women. The only opposition manifested was as to the resolution denouncing those who charged the movement with free love objects. Lucretia Mott thought the resolution out of place, and Stephen S. Foster and Mrs. Livermore considered it highly proper. An attempt was made to make the wording more pointed, but it failed, and the resolution passed by a large majority. Julia Ward How was re-elected president, and a long list of vice-presidents was also chosen.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL. Edited by LYDIA E. BECKER.—Volume I., 1870.—In coloured cover, price 1s.; post free, 1s. 3d.—London: Trübner and Co., Paternoster Row. Manchester: A. Ireland & 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.—July 1, 1871.