WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

VOL. XIV.—No. 165. PUBLISHED MONTHLY. SEPTEMBER 1, 1883. PRICE ONE PENNY. BY POST THREE HALFPENCE.

Contents:

PETITION! PETITION! PETITION!—Friends of Women's Suffrage are earnestly exhorted to aid the cause by collecting signatures during the recess for petitions, to be presented in support of Mr. Mason's Resolution, which may come on for discussion at an early date next session. Petitions from women householders or others who possess the qualifications which entitle men to vote are particularly valuable. Special forms of petition to be signed by such women, as well as general petitions, ready for signature, will be supplied on application to Miss BECKER, 29, Parliament-street, London, S.W., or 28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester; Miss BLACKBURN, 20, Park-street, Bristol; or Miss KIRKLAND, 13, Raeburn Place, Edinburgh.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.—Communications for the Editor and Orders for the Journal to be addressed to Miss BECKER, 29, Parliament-street, Westminster, London, S.W.; or to the Office, 28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester.

PETITIONS.

PARLIAMENTARY FRANCHISE.—*For Extension to Women.*

Brought forward, Petitions 469—Signatures 13,575

July			
*21764	11	Cheshunt and others (Mr. Cowper)	32
*21765	,,	Sarah Dyke, a woman farmer in the county of Radnor (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21766	,,	Elizabeth Whitford and Elizabeth Rabey, women farmers in the county of Cornwall (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	2
*21767	,,	Mary Michell, a woman farmer in the county of Cornwall (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21768	,,	Charlotte Sowden, a woman farmer in the county of Cornwall (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21769	,,	Ann Botters, a woman farmer in the county of Cornwall (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21770	,,	Susanna Rundle, a woman farmer in the county of Cornwall (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21771	,,	Mary Henwood Masters, a woman farmer in the county of Cornwall (Mr. Wm. Ewart Gladstone)...	1
*21772	,,	Mary Spargo, a woman farmer in the county of Cornwall (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21773	,,	Susanna Maddever, a woman farmer in the county of Cornwall (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone) ...	1
*21774	,,	Sophia Prout, a woman farmer in the county of Cornwall (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21775	,,	Sarah Harvey, a woman farmer in the county of Cornwall	1
*21776	,,	Thomasine T. Bonhay, a woman farmer in the county of Cornwall (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone) ...	1
*21777	,,	Sarah Elliott, a woman farmer in the county of Cornwall (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21778	,,	Jane Collings, a woman farmer in the county of Cornwall (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21779	,,	Ann Bolitho, a woman farmer in the county of Cornwall (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21780	,,	Eliza Pomery, a woman farmer in the county of Cornwall (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21781	,,	Mary Berryman, a woman farmer in the county of Cornwall (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21782	,,	Elizabeth Trembath, a woman farmer in the county of Cornwall (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone) ...	1
*21783	,,	Mary Thomas Trehale, a woman farmer in the county of Cornwall (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone) ...	1
*21784	,,	Loveday Ann Davies, a woman farmer in the county of Cornwall, and another (Mr. W. E. Gladstone)...	2
*21785	,,	Marley Hamley, a woman farmer in the county of Devon (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)...	1
*21786	,,	Mary Ann Caunter, a woman farmer in the county of Devon (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21787	,,	Sarah S. Woolland, a woman farmer in the county of Devon (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)...	1
*21788	,,	Miriam Banbury, a woman farmer in the county of Devon (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)...	1
*21789	,,	Elizabeth Tucker, a woman farmer in the county of Devon (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)...	1
*21790	,,	Mrs. Philips, a woman farmer in the county of Devon (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21791	,,	Sarah Mattocks, a woman farmer in the county of Devon (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21792	,,	Sarah Abell, a woman farmer in the county of Devon (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21793	,,	Louisa Heywood, a woman farmer in the county of Devon (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)...	1
*21794	,,	Margaret Vervin, a woman farmer in the county of Devon (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)...	1
*21795	,,	Rhoda Hockey, a woman farmer in the county of Devon (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)...	1
*21796	,,	Jane Ellen Fill, a woman farmer in the county of Devon (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21797	,,	Ann Gomez and others, women farmers in the county of Devon (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	7
*21798	,,	Elean Saunders and others, women farmers in the county of Devon (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	3
*21799	,,	Frances Gould and Jane Newbury, women farmers in the county of Devon (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	2
*21800	,,	Amy Moore and Amy Bickley, women farmers in the county of Devon (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	2
July			
*21801	11	Mary Pottenger and Elizabeth Symes, women farmers in the county of Somerset (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	2
*21802	,,	Elizabeth Dimmock, a woman farmer in the county of Somerset (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21803	,,	Eliza Stabbries, a woman farmer in the county of Somerset (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21804	,,	Mary Ann Nosh and Emma J. Burge, women farmers in the county of Somerset (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	2
*21805	,,	Caroline Harden, a woman farmer in the county of Somerset (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone	1
*21806	,,	Ellen Feltham, a woman farmer in the county of Somerset (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21807	,,	Ellen Nation Shorney, a woman farmer in the county of Somerset (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone) ...	1
*21808	,,	Sarah Sibley, a woman farmer in the county of Somerset (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21809	,,	Anne Tenell, a woman farmer in the county of Somerset (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21810	,,	Cicely Neville, a landowner in the county of Somerset (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21811	,,	E. Godsall, a woman farmer in the county of Hereford (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21812	,,	Jane Brisbane, a woman farmer in the county of Hereford (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21813	,,	Mary A. Jones, a woman farmer in the county of Hereford (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21814	,,	Ann Savage, a woman farmer in the county of Hereford (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21815	,,	Martha Matthews, a woman farmer in the county of Hereford (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21816	,,	Jane Herring, a woman farmer in the county of Hereford (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21817	,,	Mary Anne Kendrick, a woman farmer in the county of Hereford (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone) ...	1
*21818	,,	Ann Page, a woman farmer in the county of Hereford (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21819	,,	Ann Harris, a woman farmer in the county of Hereford (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21820	,,	Caroline Wellings, a woman farmer in the county of Hereford (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21821	,,	Mary Dale and Ann Hill, women farmers of the county of Hereford (Mr. Wm. Ewart Gladstone) ..	2
*21822	,,	Anna Lewis and others, women farmers in the county of Hereford (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone) ...	3
*21823	,,	Charlotte Hobby and others, women farmers in the county of Hereford (Mr. Wm. Ewart Gladstone)...	3
*21824	,,	E. Godsall and E. Adams, women farmers in the county of Hereford (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	2
*21825	,,	Elizabeth Jenkins, a woman farmer in the county of Cardigan (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21826	,,	Mary Thomas, a woman farmer in the county of Cardigan (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21827	,,	Winifred Jones, a woman farmer in the county of Cardigan (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21828	,,	Margaret Richard, a woman farmer in the county of Cardigan (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21829	,,	Mary Davies, a woman farmer in the county of Cardigan (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21830	,,	Cranogwen Rees and Anne Griffiths, women farmers in the county of Cardigan (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	2
*21831	,,	Elizabeth Davies and others, women farmers in the county of Cardigan (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	6
*21832	,,	Mary Jones and others, women householders in the county of Cardigan (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	5
*21833	,,	Mary Richards, a woman farmer in the county of Monmouth (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)... ...	1
*21834	,,	Anne Jones, a woman farmer in the county of Monmouth (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1
*21835	,,	Mary Anne Doyle, a woman farmer in the county of Monmouth (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)... ...	1
*21836	,,	Louisa Lawrence, a woman farmer in the county of Monmouth (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)... ...	1
*21837	,,	Eliza Waugh, a woman farmer in the county of Monmouth (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone)	1

The Petitions marked thus (*) are substantially similar to that from Plymouth.

The remainder of the petitions will be reported next month.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

VOL. XIV.—No. 165. PUBLISHED MONTHLY. SEPTEMBER 1, 1883. PRICE ONE PENNY. BY POST THREE HALFPENCE.

THE session of Parliament which closed last month has not been marked by any legislative gain for women. No proposal for the amendment of the law in favour of women has been even submitted to the Legislature, with the exception of Mr. MASON'S motion, and that was an abstract Resolution and not a Bill. The reception of that proposal, however, showed such an increase in the supporters and diminution of the opponents as to justify confident hope of success at no distant period, and to give the most powerful incentive to energetic work during the recess in support of the Parliamentary action to be adopted next session.

ADMIRAL Sir JOHN HAY has placed on the paper a notice for next session to call the attention of the House to the question of Parliamentary Reform and the re-distribution of seats, and to move resolutions. The first of these resolutions is, "That, in the opinion of this House, the claim of every male householder of full age, and who is not indebted in rates or taxes, to vote for the election of members of Parliament is admitted."

If this proposal should be submitted to the House of Commons, it will be hard to see why those who admit the justice of the claim of the male householder should not also admit the claim of the woman householder of full age and who is not indebted in rates or taxes. There is every reason to anticipate that if the forthcoming Reform Bill should be based on the establishment throughout the country of a uniform household residential suffrage, the claim of the women householders will be found to be irresistible, and that it must be granted along with the others.

IT is said that Mr. LOWTHER, the Conservative candidate for Rutland, has announced his intention of visiting personally the 1,800 electors who form the constituency. Nothing could show more clearly than an incident of this sort the advantage to be derived from the possession of a vote. Every man on the register of electors will have an opportunity of personally setting forth his opinions, wishes, or grievances, and of explaining personally to the candidate for his support the matters which affect his interests. This advantage will be enjoyed to a certain extent by the wives of these men. In many instances the visit of a candidate or his agent is paid to a household with a vote, in the absence of its head, the elector himself. In such cases the interview takes place with the mistress of the house, and it is an axiom with electioneerers that the conciliation of the goodwill of the wife is an important element in a successful canvass. Indeed, we have frequently seen it asserted that if the wife's promise of support can be secured the husband's vote is pretty certain to follow, and this consideration has been urged by the opponents of women's suffrage in support of the proposition that women have sufficient political influence already.

But even granting that this is the case so far as the represented households of the district extend, what is to be said of those households which are totally unrepresented by reason of having a woman at their head? These households will number in the case of Rutland between two hundred and three hundred, assuming that the proportion of women to men possessing the electoral qualification is the same as in the country generally. It is highly improbable that either Mr. LOWTHER or his opponent, or any agent on behalf of either of them, will waste time and strength in attending to the wishes or the interests of persons who have no votes to bestow. Yet these women, among whom will be found landowners, farmers, shopkeepers, and persons carrying on other avocations under the same conditions and with the same intelligence and industry as men, and liable to exactly the same imposts and burdens, are passed over in the election as persons of no account—not being regarded as having sufficient intelligence to decide whether a Conservative or a Liberal shall be sent to represent them in the House of Commons.

LAST month we were staying at a house within the borough of Chelsea, when one day we observed upon the hall table a paper, apparently the leaf of a volume. On

examination the paper proved to be the portion of the Parliamentary register containing the list for the street in which the house was situated. The registration authorities, with praiseworthy diligence, appear to have caused to be left at every inhabited house in the borough the leaf of the list on which the occupier of that house ought to be entered as an elector, in order that any householder entitled to vote, who did not find his name duly inscribed therein, should have the opportunity of claiming to be put on the register in the annual revision of the lists. This was done in order that the intentions of the Legislature in the Act of 1867, as defined by Mr. DISRAELI—*i.e.*, to give a vote to every householder rated for the relief of the poor—might be thoroughly carried out.

Notwithstanding all this elaborate precaution, the household of which we were temporarily an inmate would not be inscribed on the electoral list. The head of it, the taxpayer and the ratepayer, was a woman. She maintained that household by her honourable industry; she punctually met the demands of the landlord, tax-gatherer, and rate-collector; she obeyed the laws of her country, and injured or offended no one, but conducted herself and her household in a discreet and orderly manner; yet this woman is deemed unfit to exercise a privilege which is given to the lowest and most illiterate male householder who happens to reside within the boundary of any borough in Great Britain.

These men may be found in hundreds loafing about the corners of the streets, seemingly incapable of rational thought and even of healthful recreation; but they are all electors, and in that capacity they are the persons whom the educated and intelligent women of the land have to recognise as their sovereigns and masters. What these decree is to be sacredly observed as "the will of the people," while all women are cast out from among those whose votes are to be counted in determining what is "the will of the people" on any particular question of the day—political, social, moral, or religious.

A CORRESPONDENT of *Truth* gives an account of what appears to be an illegal mode of oppression practised on women in Cornwall by the dealers in knitted goods, guernseys, etc. Specimens of these guernseys can be seen at the Fisheries Exhibition with the Cornish arms upon them. The dealers employ women to knit these guernseys, and pay them not in money, but in drapery goods. The worsted is weighed out to them on delivery, and the guernsey is weighed when received by the draper. The amount allowed for knitting is about 4s. 6d., but the payment is made by goods from the employer's shop. The system is liable to extreme abuse, as the employer not only dictates his price for the labour, but charges what he likes for the goods which he pays for it. The employers are so united that there appears to be not a single instance in which the earnings are paid in coin, and the women in their ignorance think they must accept goods or nothing.

The editor of *Truth* suggests that the dealers might possibly be brought under the operations of the Truck Act, but the correspondent remarks that "the women are aware that the employers all employ the same system, consequently *they bear the injustice, being ignorant of their rights.*"

The italics are ours. We believe that in many other cases than those of the Cornish guernsey knitters women bear injustice, not always because they are ignorant of their rights, but because they are deprived of the constitutional means of defending them.

IN its comment on the recent debate on women's suffrage the *Saturday Review* says: "The anonymous member who announced that he should vote for excluding women because they were women exhausted the subject. If there were a proposal to transfer babies to masculine custody, the same judicious member would probably oppose the change because the proposed nurses were men."

The anonymous reviewer appears to be as ill informed as to the legal custody of babies as on the subject of women landowners. He conveniently ignores the fact that at present the legal custody of babies is vested in men because they are men. The law regards parental rights as exclusively paternal rights. The very existence of mothers is ignored in discussing questions relating to the custody of children. In any question relating to the care or custody or welfare of children that come before the courts there are, according to the law, only two parties to be taken cognisance of, the father and the child. "A mother's rights are *nil*," say the judges, and this ruling governs all decisions on the subject. There is, therefore, more connection between votes and babies than appears to be dreamed of in the philosophy of the *Saturday Review*. The sex which has the votes has the custody of the babies too.

A JUDGMENT was delivered in the Supreme Court of Judicature on July 24th which illustrates in a way that words cannot shew the absolute nullity of the rights of mothers by law. This was on an appeal from the refusal of Mr. Justice PEARSON of an application on behalf of Mrs. and Miss AGAR-ELLIS, that Miss AGAR-ELLIS, now aged sixteen years, might be allowed to visit and spend her two months' summer vacation with her mother, that in future Mrs. AGAR-ELLIS might have free access to and to visit her daughter, and that they might be allowed free communication by letter or otherwise.

It may be remembered that Mr. AGAR-ELLIS, who was married in 1864 to the Hon. Miss STONOR, was a member of the Church of England, and, as a condition of the bride's and her friends' consent to the marriage, he made a solemn promise that all the children of the marriage should be brought up as Roman Catholics. Soon after the birth of the first child Mr. AGAR-ELLIS broke this promise, and determined that all his children should be brought up as Protestants. Unhappily differences arose between the parents on this question, as was natural. Mrs. AGAR-ELLIS, acting on the strength of the antenuptial agreement, "considered she was warranted in disregarding her husband's wishes and positive commands," and instructed her children in the tenets of her own religion. In consequence of these differences a separation took place in 1878. The children were removed from the care of their mother and placed with clergymen and at schools, great restraints being placed by the father on any communication either by letter or personally between the mother and her children. In 1881 an order was made by Sir JAMES HANNEN to allow the petitioner, Miss HARRIET AGAR-ELLIS, to stay a few weeks during her summer holidays with her mother, and that was the only occasion on which she had been allowed to pay her a visit. In January last Mr. AGAR-ELLIS consented to allow his daughter, subject to his control, to practise the Roman Catholic religion. Under these circumstances the young lady, with her mother, had petitioned the Court for leave to visit and spend her next holidays with her mother, urging that there was no longer any objection on religious grounds to unrestricted intercourse between her mother and daughter, that her father had no place to take her to for the holidays, and with one exception had never spent a vacation with her and her sisters for over four years, that she was always among strangers, and was longing to see some of her relatives. Mr. Justice PEARSON, when the case was before him three weeks since, felt himself bound with very great regret to dismiss the petition, on the ground that he could not, in the absence of any suggested fault on the part of the father, interfere with the right which the father had to control the custody and to decide upon the proper residence of his own children. From this refusal the petitioners, the HON. Mrs. AGAR-ELLIS and Miss AGAR-ELLIS, now appealed.

The appeal was heard before the MASTER of the ROLLS (Sir W. BALIOL BRETT) and Lords Justices COTTON and BOWEN. In support of the appeal it was contended that when a child had attained to years of discretion (fourteen years in the case of a boy, and sixteen years in the case of a girl) the father would have no legal right to compel the child to return to him if she were to take the law into her own hands, and go away to live with strangers, more especially when the child, as in this case, had expressed a wish to visit her mother. This was a case in which the Court ought, in the interests of the young lady, to allow her the benefit of her mother's society, than whom at this period of her life there could be no one better fitted to guide and direct her. By consenting that his daughter should remain in the Roman Catholic faith, Mr. AGAR-ELLIS had removed any ground that might previously have existed for separating her from her mother.

At the conclusion of the argument, the MASTER of the ROLLS asked if Mr. AGAR-ELLIS would consent that the letters that passed between the mother and daughter should not be read by strangers. Mr. DAVEY, Q.C., after consulting with his client, who was in court, said he had no instructions to consent to this proposition.

The MASTER of the ROLLS, with some warmth: "Do, for GOD'S sake, talk the matter over with your client. Can he ever have been at school? Does he know what the feelings of boys and girls are? The idea of having their letters to their parents read by their school masters or mistresses! Such a suggestion would have caused a rebellion at every school I was ever at."

The MASTER of the ROLLS delivered the judgment of the Court, dismissing the appeal, and confirming the decision of Mr. Justice PEARSON. The principle on which the decision was based was repeatedly laid down in the course of the judgment, "The law of England recognises the rights of the father." "The rights of the father are recognised because he is the father, his duties as a father are recognised because they are natural duties." "This Court, whatever be its authority or jurisdiction, has no authority to interfere with the sacred rights of a father over his own children." "The rights of the father are sacred because his duties are sacred." "This case is not

within any of the rules which authorise the Court to interfere." "The petition must, therefore, be dismissed."

Lords Justices COTTON and BOWEN gave judgment to the same effect, observing that if they were not in a court of law, and were capable of being moved by feelings of favour or disfavour, they might be tempted to comment with more or less severity upon the way in which, so far as the case had been presented to them, the father was exercising his paternal right.

The appeal was dismissed with costs, and the application of Miss AGAR-ELLIS to visit her mother during her holidays was refused.

During the whole of the pleadings the mother was considered as a person of no account. The concession was asked for with sole reference to the feelings and the welfare of the child. It was not argued as a case between father, mother, and child, but between father and child only. No one suggested to the court that the mother had either right or duty in the matter.

We ask every woman in the land, Are not the rights of the mother as sacred as those of the father? Are not the duties of the mother as sacred and indefeasible as those of the father? Yet the barbarous code which the judges of the highest court in the realm see themselves compelled with reluctance and shame to enforce does not recognise any right in a mother, ignores her very existence as a person to be considered in questions of parental right, tramples ruthlessly on maternal and filial feelings, and also even denies to a mother any legal right to the performance of her most sacred and indefeasible maternal duties.

THE tendency of men to use violent measures when they have a fancy they have cause of complaint against their wives is already so irrepressible that one would have hardly thought it needed to be stimulated by utterances from the judicial bench. Not so think the magistrates of Sedgley, Wolverhampton. On July 18th, Mrs. DOWNS appeared before the police court in that place to answer for her husband, who had been summoned for neglect to send his children to school. In the course of the proceedings the woman said that sooner than disclose the name of the school which her daughter attended she would pay a fine. Whereupon Mr. HOMER, one of the magistrates, asked her if her husband worked hard, and on being answered in the affirmative, he said to her: "If I was your husband and you persisted in throwing my hard-earned money away I should give you the strap." Mrs. DOWNS very properly replied: "And if you were my husband and gave me the strap I should take you before some one." After more altercation, the magistrate said: "A wife like you deserves the strap."

Husbands within the jurisdiction of the Sedgley Police Court are thus informed that they may with magisterial sanction give their wives the strap in order to correct them, and wives who undergo this whipping are warned that if they complain of such treatment the bench may consider, in giving its judgment, whether or not "wives like them deserve the strap." The attention of the HOME SECRETARY was called to this extraordinary utterance, by Mr. P. A. TAYLOR in the House of Commons, and in reply to the question Sir W. HARCOURT said he was informed that the magistrate was joking. He expressed the opinion that magistrates ought to avoid such jokes.

We trust that the caution will be observed, for undoubtedly the personal security of wives within the district where magistrates indulge in such amusements is liable to be sensibly diminished by the sanction given, even in jest, to the notion that a husband has a right under any circumstances or any provocation to "give his wife the strap."

A PARLIAMENTARY paper has been issued recently, showing the qualifications for the Parliamentary franchise in foreign countries, from which we learn that in France "the only persons formally excluded by law from the political franchise are members of the army and navy, when on service;" in Germany officers of the army and navy are eligible as candidates for the Reichstag, but "no one serving on the actual list of either service can vote at elections." Thus the two most military nations of the world are specially careful to exclude the fighting element from their electorate. Hungary also excludes the members of its army and navy, its constables and gendarmes. Spain grants its franchise to "generals out of employment," and to officers when they are pensioned off, and also to soldiers who have the cross of San Fernando.

There is, however, one country which makes military service a special qualification, and that is the country which has so lately admitted women to a modified form of franchise—Italy, by whose Reform Bill of last year widows vote through their sons. The qualifications for the franchise in Italy are—to be able to read and write, and to fulfil one of several conditions, the first of which is to have satisfactorily passed the elementary course of public instruction; others refer to certain trades and occupations, and one is the having "served actively under arms for two years." Another of these conditions is

worthy of note for its equal recognition of valour that belongs to peace as well as valour that belongs to war, viz., "to be decorated with the gold or silver medal for naval, military, or civil valour, or sanitary merit."

Dalmatia stands alone in the provinces of the Austrian Empire, as the Isle of Man stands alone in the British Empire, in admitting to its property franchise women "who are in possession of their own property." Portugal is on the eve of a new Reform Bill; whether there is any intention to follow the example of Italy and open a way for women does not appear, but the present position is a curious one. Until 1878 the qualification was an annual income of 100 milreis (£22. 5s.); in that year the qualification was changed into ability to read and write. "The idea had been that a man who supported a family, and could read and write, would command an income of £22. 5s. But in practice it has been discovered 'that beggars and persons without any known occupation,' who do not exercise the franchise even in countries where universal suffrage exists, found means of getting themselves registered as voters." While Portugal thus desires to exclude its sturdy beggars from political privileges, Connecticut and Vermont are equally desirous to exclude persons likely to enter into the "tussle of the streets" that Mr. LEATHAM commends; for Connecticut "exacts 'a good moral character,' and Vermont only admits to the privileges of freemen, on taking an oath or affirmation, those of 'quiet and peaceable behaviour.'" H. B.

WE learn that an Italian lady, Signorina LIDIA POET, has been admitted to the dignity of Doctor of Laws, and has asked to be called to the Bar in Turin. The application has been acceded to by the Order of Advocates with great courtesy and approbation, but not altogether without dissent, two eminent advocates, CHIAVES and SPANTIGATI, having withdrawn from the Council in consequence of the innovation. Their friend and brother advocate, D'ARCAIS, has, however, attempted to convert them, and has addressed a long letter on the subject to a leading Italian journal. The career of Signorina LIDIA POET will be observed with interest by all who desire to see the extension of the principle of the free exercise by women of the gifts with which they may have been endowed by nature, and the opening to them of any professional career which their tastes and abilities lead them to desire.

LADIES have been admitted to practise at the Bar in some of the American States, and one lady, Mrs. BELVA LOCKWOOD, was admitted to the Bar of the District of Columbia, in 1873, and in 1879 she was admitted to practise in the Supreme Court of the United States. Her presence in the Courtroom during her ten years' practice at Washington is admitted on all hands to have had a good effect, and during that period she has built up an extensive practice. But perhaps more remarkable than either of those is the case of a native lady in Madras, who has been granted permission by Mr. NAYADU, B.A., a sub-magistrate, to practise in his court as a private pleader. The new practitioner is described as the wife of the Rev. S. ETHIRAJULU, whom native Christians may still remember as a lady speaking English very fluently and charmingly, and European in her habits except in her dress.

MADAME EDMOND ADAM, who occupies a very distinguished position in the literary and social circles of Paris, has recently published in *La Nouvelle Revue*, of which she is editor, an article by Lady HARBERTON, entitled "La vote des femmes en Angleterre." This article has made a great sensation, and many French papers have given extracts from it. Madame ADAM has also circulated with the current number of her Review a pamphlet by Madame SALES, giving a short chronological account of the movement for the enfranchisement of women all over the world. The pamphlet has been received with much interest by Frenchwomen. Madame ADAM hopes that a serious movement may take root and grow in France. She intends to give articles on the subject in her Review, which deserves to be widely known and read in England.

We learn from *Le Droit des Femmes* that many French papers had articles in favour of the enfranchisement of women after the recent debate in the House of Commons. Among these *La France* said, in reference to Mr. MASON'S resolution, "After a lively debate this motion, which with us would probably have been met by the previous question, was only rejected by 130 votes to 114. . . . One more effort, and the cause will be gained. For our part we earnestly wish for the speedy success of the English *féministes*. We have not the slightest prejudice against the political capacity of women; on the contrary, we incline to believe in it, and to recognise it as equal to that of men, especially when they shall have received the same education as ourselves. We shall not be sorry to be confirmed in this sentiment by the experiment, absolutely conclusive we hope, which our neighbours across the channel are on the eve of trying with all the force of their earnest and practical minds."

PARLIAMENTARY INTELLIGENCE.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, *August* 7.

WOMEN TELEGRAPHISTS.

Mr. MACLIVER asked the Postmaster-General if he was aware that a new portion of duty had been assigned to the female telegraphists at the chief office (from 1 p.m. to 9 p.m.), contrary to the assurance given to the House that under no circumstances would females be employed after 8 p.m. ; and whether this alteration, if continued, would not prove detrimental to the service by deterring eligible young women from entering it.

Mr. FAWCETT : I am not aware that I have ever given such an assurance as my hon. friend states—viz., that under no circumstances would females be employed after 8 p.m. It has been the practice for many years past, during the summer months, to keep a few female telegraphists upon duty up to 9 p.m., to meet pressure of business in the busy season. It rarely happens that more than 12 female telegraphists out of a force of 600 are required to perform this duty, and I do not think it will be found to be detrimental to the service.

August 8.

A MAGISTERIAL JOKE.

Sir W. Harcourt, replying to Mr. P. Taylor, said he was informed that when a magistrate at Sedgley Police-court, on the 17th July, said to a woman who was charged with neglecting to send her child to school—"If I was your husband and you persisted in throwing my hard-earned money away, I should give you the strap," he was joking. He (Sir W. Harcourt) thought that the magistrates ought to avoid such jokes. (Hear, hear.)

PETITION FROM WOMEN FARMERS.

Amongst the petitions presented in favour of Mr. Mason's Resolution was one signed by 170 women farmers, and forwarded to Mr. Gladstone with the following letter :—

"Staverton House, near Cheltenham, July 5th, 1883.

"Sir,—I have taken the liberty of asking you to present to Parliament the accompanying important petition from women farmers resident in South Wales and midland counties. The petition is in favour of the extension of the Parliamentary suffrage to women ratepayers.

"I will not trespass on your most valuable time, but I feel constrained to say how intensified the grievances of us farmers and landowners have become with the prospect of the speedy enfranchisement of the agricultural labourer. If the oft-time totally ignorant agricultural labourer be deemed worthy the franchise and women farmers be still excluded from that boon, we shall indeed feel that insult is added to the undoubted injury that already exists through women not possessing the Parliamentary vote.

"It is a well known fact that the widows and daughters of farmers are frequently rejected as tenants by large landowners for the sole reason that their sex disqualifies them from giving their landlord that Parliamentary vote which it has been his custom to expect from his tenants, and yet these same women have proved their undoubted business capacity by years of successful management during the illness or incapacity of their husband or father.—I am, sir, your obedient servant,

(Signed) "HARRIET M'ILQUHAM.

"The Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone,
First Lord of the Treasury."

"10, Downing-street, Whitehall, 6th July, 1883.

"Madam,—I am directed by Mr. Gladstone to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of yesterday, and to say that he will not fail to present the petition to which you refer.—I am, madam, your obedient servant, (Signed) "HORACE SEYMOUR.

"Mrs. H. M'Ilquham."

AN AFRICAN QUEEN.—A proclamation was issued at Freetown, West Africa, on August 14th, announcing that Her Majesty's Government has accepted from Queen Messeh the ceded territory of Kitim, on the coast adjoining Sherbro.

SUMMER LECTURES.

WORTHING.

Mrs. Fenwick Miller, member of the London School Board, delivered a lecture at the Literary Institution, Montague-street, Worthing, on August 13th, under the auspices of the National Society for Women's Suffrage. The subject of the lecture was announced as "Woman's Work in the World, with reference to a vote for Members of Parliament." At the commencement of the meeting there were not more than fifty persons in the room, but as the lecturer proceeded the audience increased, and at the close there were probably two hundred present, the greater part being ladies. The chair was taken by Mr. A. J. C. Browne. Having expressed himself of the opinion that woman should have her rights, Mr. Browne introduced

Mrs. MILLER, who said she was pleased to see so many ladies present, for this was essentially a woman's question. She was quite sure that as soon as women woke up to their proper duties in life the better would it be for mankind in general. Woman no doubt had her special work in the domestic circle, but there were duties outside of that to which the sex could devote themselves to their own advantage and for the good of the human race. She (the lecturer) asked in the first place that women's eyes might be open to this fact ; and, in the next, that they should meet with encouragement. The question was frequently asked how it was that women had only begun to ask for these privileges now ? When the Women's Suffrage Bill was brought forward in the House of Commons the other evening, the gentleman who led the opposition, although calling himself a Radical, used as his principal argument that the proposal was opposed to the immemorial usages of mankind. To this the lecturer would reply that many of the blessings now enjoyed were opposed to immemorial usage. It was only within the last few years that men had generally had a voice in the government of the country ; and it could not be expected that what had been denied to men would be readily conceded to women. Still there had been instances in bygone days of great women having taken their share in government, and notably that of Queen Elizabeth. It was only within the last forty or fifty years that women had been at all encouraged to do anything in either literature, science, or art ; but still they would find that many great and useful women had persevered in these branches of learning in the face of all the opposition that could possibly be put in their way. They would very often find persons—generally very young men—who said that women were not fit to exercise a voice in public affairs, because they were not sufficiently intelligent. Mr. Newdegate, in the House of Commons the other night, stated that bankrupts were not allowed to vote for a member of Parliament, neither were men not of sane mind, and in the same way Mr. Newdegate argued that women were not fit to exercise a vote. It was often said that women were not great writers and artists, but she (Mrs. Miller) would only point to Rosa Bonheur and George Eliot in refutation of this. But their opponents always had an answer ready to the effect that those women were exceptions. The lecturer could recollect when it was said that women would never be able to go through the study necessary to enable them to pass an examination ; but at the recent examination of candidates at the London University, 72 per cent of the women passed, whilst only 53 per cent of the men were successful. Those figures showed that the girls of the present day were growing up in a state of society which encouraged them. When one was seeking for fame, or for the applause of the public, their first desire was to obtain the approval of those nearest to them. This necessary encouragement had for years been denied their sex, but the lecturer instanced Mary Somerville and Harriet Martineau as women who had surmounted the opposition of their friends. Mrs. Miller thought that society had for some years been acting upon the principle of a Chinese proverb, which said that "A man should never talk about what happens his own home within ; but for a woman it is a sin to know what goes on without." There, however, occurred to her one practical illustration from history of the value to society of admitting women to take a larger practical share in the government of affairs. From the time of Charles II. up to the present the women belonging to the Quaker sect had been placed upon the same equality as the men. This was the one distinctive difference between the Quakers and any other sect. Let them look at the influence upon the Quaker men, many of whom had been great leaders in the greatest movements of modern times, and the sect generally had shown a respectability and capacity for business unequalled in other denominations. Referring more especially to the subject of women's suffrage, Mrs. Miller said the subject came before the House of Commons in the form of a resolution to the effect that it was expedient that women who possessed the other legal qualifications should have a vote for a member of Parliament the same as men. Let them imagine a street, nearly every householder in which had a vote. In one house, however, the occupier was a woman—may be a spinster. This woman was called upon to pay her rates and taxes and had an equal interest in the maintenance of law and order the same as her neighbours, but the mere fact of her being a woman disqualified her from having a vote. In another house perhaps the occupier was a widow, her husband had died and the whole burden of citizenship has descended upon her shoulders, and was it right and just to say that these should not have a voice in the spending of the public money and in the administration of public affairs ? All that was claimed under the Women's Suffrage Bill was that those who had to do the same as men in these matters should have the same privileges. The lecturer said they did not ask for women to be eligible to become members of Parliament, although personally she thought the House of Commons would be much improved by the presence of ladies. She was quite sure that no man who sat at the London School Board would say that women were incapable of following out a train of argument, or that they had not shown themselves quite as capable as the men ; but the House of Commons preferred to keep its hat on and to put its feet upon the benches, things they would not be able to do if there were ladies present. She advised the ladies before her to realise the fact that the disqualification was one purely of sex. Every woman, no matter how great her intelligence, her education, her property, or her interest in public affairs, was debarred the privileges of the franchise, simply because she was a woman and not a man. The law said that because of their sex they were unworthy to have a voice in public affairs. This was an insult and degradation to their sex. It was conclusively shown by the speeches made against the proposal in the House of Commons, that the resolution was rejected upon the principle that women, however excellent, are inferior to men, however bad. After all, it was a very small thing that they were asking, for they only desired that every seventh voter should be a woman ; and if the reasons against it were not that they were inferior to men, what reasons could there be ? Women had a close personal interest in everything that took place in the House of Commons, and there was no question which did not affect them equally as much as the other sex. Be it a matter of Peace or War, they were just as deeply interested. Women householders would have to bear their share of the extra taxation ; and in their personal feeling women had more at stake than the men. It was true that men had to bear arms in the field of battle ; but who would not rather go into the fight and share its dangers and glories and successes, than stay at home anxiously watching and waiting lest they should hear of the death of those nearest and dearest. But to turn to home legislation, let them take the question of the water supply of the metropolis. It was quite within the bounds of possibility that England would be visited by the cholera, the germs of which disease were spread through impure drinking water. The proposal to transfer the London water supply from the hands of private companies to that of public bodies had been shelved again this session, but it would not have been if women had a voice in political affairs, for they would be the greatest sufferers if the dire disease should make its appearance. Another matter affecting women was the proposal this year to make a law by which every person afflicted with an infectious disease should be at once removed from his friends. Let them imagine the cruelty of wresting a baby of two years of age from its mother, and refusing her the power to claim the blessed and fearful privilege of attending her sick child. This measure had, however, for the present been defeated through the exertions of the Vigilance Association for the Defence of Personal Rights, supported chiefly by ladies. Many other questions there were in which women had as great an interest as men, and no doubt as they became more educated they would take a greater interest in political affairs. It was often said that women were sufficiently represented by the men, but that argument had been used with regard to the interests of workmen being sufficiently represented by their masters, and had been worn out. There was no doubt that if women had been given the franchise many reforms that the public were longing for would have been brought about ; and those that had been obtained would have been obtained earlier. Mrs. Miller thought the Married Women's Property Act would have been passed earlier ; whilst some more stringent measure would have been carried dealing with assaults upon wives. There was no doubt that the women's suffrage question was gaining strength. In 1867, when the measure was first introduced, only eighty M.P.'s voted for it ; on the last debate that number was more than doubled. There was a great reason why special effort should be made just now. The present Parliament was pledged to pass a measure assimilating the borough and county franchise. Were women of wealth and high education to be shut out of the next Reform Bill ? Were the women farmers to be denied the privilege that was to be given to the most ignorant labourer in their employ ? If this opportunity of getting the franchise for women made a part of the new Reform Bill were lost, they might have to wait years for such a favourable chance. Mrs. Miller asked all present to assist the society she represented.

At the suggestion of the Chairman a vote of thanks to the lecturer was proposed and seconded by two ladies present, and a similar compliment to Mr. Brown brought the meeting to a close.

LITTLEHAMPTON.

Mrs. Fenwick Miller delivered an address of a similar character to that at Worthing, on August 16th, in the Lecture Hall, Littlehampton. Mr. Ford occupied the chair. The hall was well filled, and the audience, consisting largely of ladies, showed interest in the proceedings.

EASTBOURNE.

On August 24th, Mrs. Fenwick Miller, member of the London School Board, and authoress of "Readings in Social Economy," gave her lecture on the subject of "Woman, and her work in the world," at New Hall, Seaside Road, Eastbourne. The chair was taken at eight o'clock, by Mr. Frederick A. Ford, of London. The lecture was given under the auspices of the National Society for Women's Suffrage, and had special reference to voting for members of Parliament. The lecture was similar in character to that delivered at Worthing.

MRS. FAWCETT ON WOMEN AND REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT.

Under this title Mrs. Fawcett has contributed an able and timely article to the August number of *The Nineteenth Century*, from which we make the following extracts. The article is based on the speech delivered by Mrs. Fawcett, at the recent meeting at St. James' Hall, with some additions.

"Those who have been labouring in behalf of the removal of the electoral disabilities of women, feel that a very critical time in the history of the agitation is now approaching. The question of Parliamentary reform, and a further extension of the principle of household suffrage, will probably occupy the attention of the House of Commons during a great part of next session. The old familiar arguments that taxation without representation is tyranny, that those who are subject to the law and fulfil the obligations of citizenship cannot be justly excluded from all share of making the laws, will be heard again and again ; and it will moreover be urged that it is alike unjust and inexpedient to place the stigma of political subjection upon whole classes of loyal, peaceable, and industrious citizens, by making the qualifications for the franchise such as they cannot fulfil. On one side of the House it will be urged that property ought to be represented ; on the other side of the House the words of Mr. Chamberlain at the Cobden Club dinner will be repeated, that 'full confidence in the people is the only sure foundation on which the government of this country can rest.' And what the advocates of a real representation of the people want to make sure of, is to remind the orators who make use of these telling phrases, that the human race consists of women as well as of men. They wish to remind the Radicals and Liberals, who have done so much to get rid of political disabilities, that the disability of sex is as repugnant to true Liberalism as are the disabilities of race and religion. They want to remind the Tory party that if a fair representation of property is what they are aiming at, they will be acting very inconsistently

if they support a system which gives no kind of representation to property, however vast, which happens to be owned by a woman.

. . . . . .

"It is not necessary here to dwell at any length on the painful subject of laws that are unjust to women. No one who has ever given even a few minutes' attention to the subject will deny that there are many laws which, to use Mr. Gladstone's expression, give to women 'something less than justice.'* If it is necessary to quote examples, the inequality which the law has created between men and women in divorce suits furnishes one. The cruel law which gives a mother no legal guardianship over her children is another. I think there can be little doubt that if similar hardships had affected any represented class, they would long ago have been swept away. As it is, however, though the injustice of these and other laws affecting women is fully and almost universally recognised, year after year rolls by and nothing is done to remedy them. Here are matters almost universally admitted to involve injustice and wrong, and no one tries to remedy them. Why is this? It is because the motive power is wanting. Representation is the motive power for the redress of legislative grievances. If not what is the use of representation? People would be as well off without it as with it. But all our history shows the practical value of representation. Before the working classes were represented, trades-unions were illegal associations, and consequently an absconding treasurer of one of these societies was liable to no legal punishment. Not one man in a thousand attempted to justify such an iniquity, even when it was an established institution. It was a recognised injustice; but it was not till the working classes were on the eve of obtaining a just share of representation that the motive power for the redress of that injustice was forthcoming. The same thing can be said with regard to those laws which press unjustly on women. Hardly anyone defends them; it is not so much the sense of justice in parliament or in the country that is wanting, as the motive power which representation, and representation alone, in a self-governed country can give, to get a recognised wrong righted. Another illustration of the value of representation may be found in looking back at recent discussions on alterations in the land laws of England and Ireland. This legislation has been discussed month in and month out, in the House of Commons and on every platform in the United Kingdom, as if the interests of two classes and two classes only had to be considered, those of the farmers and the landowners. The labourers have been apparently as much forgotten as if the land were ploughed and weeded and sown by fairies, and not by men and women, who stand at least as much in need of any good that law-making can do them, as the other classes who are directly interested in the soil.

. . . . . .

It will no doubt be argued by some, that while much yet remains to be done before the balance is adjusted, so as to give perfect justice to women, yet that much has already been done to improve their legal status, and that it is not too much to hope that in time all grievances will be redressed without giving women votes. The Married Women's Property Act, it is said, has redressed a great and crying evil; why may not other evils be redressed in the same way? To such as use this argument it may be replied that, in the first place, the Married Women's Property Act would probably never have been introduced or heard of, if it had not been for the wider movement for the parliamentary representation of women. The women's suffrage societies, by constant and untiring efforts actively carried on for sixteen years, have done something to awaken that keener sense of justice to women to which reference has just been made. However, let it be supposed that this view of the history of the passing of the Married Women's Property Act is entirely erroneous, and let it be supposed that the Legislature have, of their own free will, quite unmoved by any representations made to them by women, been graciously pleased to say that married women may have what is their own. What right has any set of human beings to say to another, 'I concede to you that piece of justice, and I withhold this, not because you ask for either, or can make me give you either, but because I choose to act so?' What is the policy, what is the sense, of compelling half the English people to hold their liberty on such terms as these? All this circumlocution is unnecessary and inexpedient. Give women the rights of free citizenship, the power to protect themselves, and then they will let their representatives know what they want and why they want it. They will find, no doubt—as other classes have found—that though the price of liberty is vigilance, the House of Commons will never turn a deaf ear to well-considered measures of reform which are demanded by the constituencies."

* Mr. Gladstone's speech in the House of Commons on the Women's Suffrage Bill, 1871.

LAW REPORT.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

July 24, 1883.

COURT OF APPEAL.

Before the Master of the Rolls and Lords Justices Cotton and Bowen.

RE AGAR-ELLIS—AGAR-ELLIS *v.* LASCELLES.

This was an appeal from the refusal by Mr. Justice Pearson of an application on behalf of Mrs. and Miss Agar-Ellis that Miss Agar-Ellis, now aged sixteen years, might be allowed to visit and spend her two months' summer vacation with her mother; that in future Mrs. Agar-Ellis might be allowed free access to, and to visit her daughter, and that they might be allowed free communication by letter or otherwise. Mr. Agar-Ellis was married in 1864 to the Hon. Miss Stonor, and previously to the marriage Mr. Agar-Ellis, who was a member of the Church of England, promised his intended wife, in the presence of her relatives, that all the children of the marriage should be brought up as members of the Roman Catholic Church, to which she belonged. There were three children of the marriage now surviving, of whom the petitioner Miss Harriet Agar-Ellis was the second, and soon after the birth of the first child Mr. Agar-Ellis, in contravention of the antenuptial promise or understanding, determined that the children should be brought up as Protestants. Unhappy differences arose upon this religious question, and Mrs. Ellis, considering that she was warranted in disregarding her husband's wishes and positive commands, had availed herself of her opportunities to instruct the children in the tenets of the Roman Catholic religion, so that ultimately they positively refused to comply with their father's directions to accompany him to a Church of England place of worship. These differences were not reconciled, a separation took place, and in 1878 proceedings were instituted by Mr. Agar-Ellis for the purpose of having the children made wards of court. In these proceedings a summons was taken out by him for obtaining the direction of the Court as to the education of the children, and thereupon Mrs. Ellis presented a petition praying that directions might be given for the custody and education of the children so as to prevent their being deprived of the society and maternal care of their mother, and to admit of their being brought up as Roman Catholics. The applications were heard together before the late Vice-Chancellor Malins, and, on appeal from his Lordship's order, before the Court of Appeal in 1878; and in the result the Court of Appeal restrained the mother from taking the children to confession or to Roman Catholic places of worship without the consent of the father, but, striking out a declaration that the children ought to be brought up as members of the Church of England, left it to the father to do what he thought best for the temporal and spiritual welfare of the children. A full report of the case at that stage is given in the Law Reports, 10, Chancery Division, p. 49. The children had been removed from the care of their mother and placed with clergymen and at schools, great restraints being placed by the father upon any communication, either by letter or personally, between the mother and her children. In July, 1881, an order was made by Sir James Hannen, before whom proceedings between Mr. and Mrs. Agar-Ellis were pending, allowing the second daughter (Miss Harriet Agar-Ellis) to stay for a few weeks during her summer holidays with her mother, and that it appeared was the only occasion on which Miss Harriet Agar-Ellis had been allowed to pay her mother a visit. It should be here stated that the proceedings which were taken in the Divorce Court by Mrs. Agar-Ellis against her husband had resulted in the dismissal of her petition. In January last Miss Agar-Ellis attained sixteen, and shortly afterwards she addressed a letter to Mr. Justice Fry, to whose court the proceedings were then attached, begging to be allowed the free use of her religion and to be permitted to live with her mother. Mr. Justice Fry directed the Chief Clerk to see the solicitors of husband and wife with a view to some amicable arrangement being made, and ultimately Mr. Agar-Ellis made proposals under which his daughter was to be allowed, subject to his control, to practise the Roman Catholic religion, to attend service at the Roman Catholic Church on Sundays and festivals, and to prepare herself for her first communion. The lady with whom Miss Harriet Agar-Ellis had been placed at Brighton was about to pay a visit of several weeks to her friends abroad, and was unable to take her with her. Under these circumstances the young lady (with her mother) had petitioned the Court for leave to visit and spend her next vacation with her mother, urging that there was no longer any objection on religious grounds to unrestricted intercourse between her mother and herself, that her father had no place to take her to for the holidays, and with one exception had never spent a vacation with her and her sisters for over four years, that she was always among strangers and was longing to see some of her relations. Mr. Justice Pearson, when the case was before him about three weeks since, felt himself bound with very great regret to dismiss the petition on the ground that he could not, in the absence of any suggested fault on the part of the father, interfere with the right which the father had to control the custody and to decide upon the the proper residence of his own children. From this refusal the petitioners, the Hon. Mrs. Agar-Ellis and Miss Agar-Ellis now appealed.

Mr. Higgins, Q.C., and Mr. Ingle Joyce appeared in support of the appeal.

Mr. Davey, Q.C. (with whom was Mr. G. Curtis Price), on behalf of the respondent, Mr. Agar-Ellis, asked yesterday that the case might be heard in private. It was not for the interests of the young lady, a ward of Court, that the painful questions between her father and mother should be discussed in open court.

Mr. Higgins stated that he should not have to state any facts affecting the character of anyone. It was a mere question of law that he had to present to the Court.

The Master of the Rolls said that the case must follow the usual course, and be heard in court.

Mr. Higgins, Q.C., and Mr. Ingle Joyce, in support of the appeal, contended that when a child had attained years of discretion (14 years in the case of a boy, and 16 in the case of a girl) the father would have no legal right upon suing out a *habeas corpus* to compel the child to return to his custody or control if she were to take the law into her own hands, and go away to live with strangers, more especially when, as in this case, the child had deliberately expressed her wish to be with her mother during her holidays. In the exercise of the jurisdiction peculiar to itself the Court would only regard the interests of the child, and would not decide the question on any theory of strict legal right, and unless absolutely bound by law to require this young lady to renounce all intercourse with her mother, it was a case in which the Court ought, in the interests of this young lady, to allow her the benefit of her mother's society and guidance. Whatever might be the legal rights of the father to control the custody and residence of his children, the Court would have regard to conduct on his part which would render it harsh, cruel, or detrimental to the interests of the child to allow his strict legal rights to prevail, and would not scruple, as in the case of a testamentary guardian, to control his authority. In this case, by consenting that his daughter should remain in the Roman Catholic faith, Mr. Agar-Ellis had removed any ground that might previously have existed for keeping her separated from her mother. Then look at the circumstances of this case. For four years past she had on one occasion only spent a portion of her holidays with her mother. It was most desirable that she should have the benefit of her mother's society, than whom, at this period of her life, there could be no one better fitted to guide and direct her. What possible reason could be suggested for depriving mother and daughter of all intercourse with each other? Not any fear of proselytising the child, who was by the father's consent being educated in her mother's religious faith. Religious grounds for the restriction there were none, and it was asked that the father should not be allowed, out of mere caprice, to prevent mother and daughter from ever meeting except under cruel and needless restrictions.

At the conclusion of the argument in support of the appeal, the Master of the Rolls, addressing Mr. Davey, Q.C. (who, with Mr. G. Curtis Price, appeared for the respondent, Mr. Agar-Ellis), asked if his client would allow interviews between Mrs. Agar-Ellis and her daughter once a fortnight instead of once a month. Would he also consent that the letters that passed between them should not be read by strangers?

Mr. Davey, Q.C. (after consulting with his client, who was in court), said that whatever his own views might be he had no instructions to consent to this proposition. The view which the father took, rightly or wrongly, was that the mother had abused her opportunities in order to influence the minds of her children against their father, and that unrestricted communication, either by letter or personally, for so long a period as two months would create a great prejudice in the children's minds.

The Master of the Rolls (with some warmth): Do for God's sake talk the matter over with your client. Can he ever have been at school? Does he know what the feelings of boys and girls from nine years upwards are? The idea of having their letters to their parents read by their shoolmasters or schoolmistresses! Such a suggestion would have caused a rebellion at every school I was ever at.

Mr. Davey, Q.C., said that it was right his Lordship should know that these letters between Mrs. Agar-Ellis and her children did not pass through any hands but those of Mr. Agar-Ellis himself.

At this point the Court adjourned.

Mr. Davey, Q.C., this morning, said that he had been unable to induce his client to give his consent to the suggestions of the Court. Mr. Agar-Ellis insisted upon his legal right to direct and control the education and bringing up of his children, and was not unwilling to make those concessions which had been pointed out by the Court yesterday. He then addressed himself to the legal argument, but was stopped by the Court.

Mr. Higgins, Q.C., was heard in reply, and submitted that, though their Lordships might be against him upon the legal points, sufficient had been shown to induce the Court to make some concession to the mother and daughter. Would their Lordships consent to see the young lady herself and ascertain her wishes?

The Master of the Rolls declined to accede to this proposal.

At the conclusion of the reply, after their Lordships had consulted together for some little time,

The Master of the Rolls said: In this case the husband and wife were married and were of different religious persuasions. The father is a Protestant, the mother a Roman Catholic. They have had children, and among others a daughter, whose case is now in question. After many and bitter controversies with regard to the education of the children, as to which persuasion they should be brought up in, the father consented that the second child should follow the religious doctrines of her mother. But insisting upon his rights, he did not allow this daughter to live with her mother, but put her into many and various places to live, and at last with a Madame Guerini, at Brighton. This lady is about to proceed abroad for a few weeks for the purpose of visiting her own relatives and friends, and of course she cannot take the young lady with her. Thereupon the mother and daughter, after requesting, by their solicitors, that the daughter, who is nearly seventeen, might for those few weeks live with her mother, not always, but for the few weeks only of Madame Guerini's absence from England, and after having had their request refused by the father, they both (mother and daughter) have presented a petition asking this Court for an order that the young lady shall, notwithstanding her father's objection, be allowed to be with her mother for a period of a few weeks, to be named by the Court. The father, though he has not absolutely forbidden all correspondence between mother and daughter, has insisted that every letter written by the daughter shall be shown to a person nominated by him, and that every letter received from the mother by the daughter should be read by some person, no relation to either mother or daughter. They have asked for an order that free access may be had between mother and daughter, and that the correspondence may be free, and also that whereas the daughter has been allowed to see her mother once a month they may now be allowed to see one another whenever they please, not at the mother's house, but at the house which the father has appointed for the child to reside at. This having been refused by the father, they have petitioned the Court that they may be allowed to correspond freely, without their correspondence being subjected to that strange control which has been imposed by the father. We proposed yesterday that the Court should not interfere with the visits of the mother, and that access to her daughter once a fortnight should be allowed, and also that their correspondence should not be subjected to this sort of supervision. These modifications were refused by the father,

who has refused, therefore, to allow his daughter to see her mother more than once a month, and also refused to allow his daughter and her mother to correspond, except upon conditions that the letters must be shown to strangers; and the Court is told that all this is done from a fear lest the affection of his daughter to himself should be altered. Now that the petition was brought before the Court, it has been argued that when a girl attained the age of sixteen her father had no longer any right to her control or custody; that the girl was emancipated and free, and that the Court ought so to declare. Then it was said that there was authority showing that when a girl aged sixteen absented herself from her father and went to live with other people, the Court, on a *habeas corpus* issued out by the father, would see the girl and ascertain from her what her views were, and, if she were content to remain where she was, would not compel her to return to the custody of her father. It was said, further, that this Court would interfere in the case of a testamentary guardian and forbid the exercise by him of the control over the infant given to him by law. I cannot accede to that argument. By the law of England the father has control over the person and education and condition of his children until they attain twenty-one years. It is also the law of England that if any one alleges that another is under illegal control, he may apply for a writ of *habeas corpus*, and have the person so controlled brought up before the Court. The question for the Court is whether the person is in illegal custody without that person's consent. Now up to a certain age infant children cannot consent or withhold consent. They can object or they can submit, but they cannot consent. The law as a general rule has fixed on a certain age, in the case of a boy at fourteen, and in the case of a girl at sixteen, up to which the Court will not, upon an application for *habeas corpus* as between father and child, inquire as to whether the child does or does not consent to remain in the place where it may be. But after that age the Court will inquire, and if it should be ascertained that the infant, no longer a child, is consenting to remain in the place where it is, then the point for granting a *habeas corpus* fails. His Lordship, after observing that the same law was now administered by all the Judges, said that the cases referred to as to the writ of *habeas corpus* did not at all apply to the propositions for which they were cited. In the present case, of course, they had no application, as this young lady was not away from her father, but under his control, and any order made upon this petition would be in effect against the father to remove her from his custody. Then, with respect to the testamentary guardian, he is a creature of law, and nature has nothing to do with him. The law of England recognises the rights of the father, not as the guardian, but because he is the father of his children, and if recognised as their guardian merely his rights would probably be limited. The father has greater rights than the testamentary guardian or any other guardian can have. The testamentary guardian is not called on to feel affection for his ward, he is not called on to forgive his ward, he is not called on to treat his ward with tenderness. He has not the rights of the father, because he is not the father. The rights of the father are recognised, because he is the father; his duties as a father are recognised, because they are natural duties. The natural duties of a father are to treat his children with the utmost affection and with infinite tenderness; to forgive his children for any slip whatever and under all circumstances. None of these duties are duties of the testamentary guardian. The law recognises these duties, from which if a father breaks he breaks from everything which nature calls upon him to do; and although the law may not be able to insist upon their performance, it is because the law recognises them, and knows that in almost every case the natural feelings of the father will prevail. The law trusts that the father will perform his natural duties, and does not, and, indeed, cannot, inquire how they have been performed. The right of the father thus recognised is not a guardian's, but a paternal right; the right of a father because he is a father, which is far higher than that of any guardian, and this because the law reposes trust in the father that he will perform his natural duties. There are, no doubt, cases which show the limits of this doctrine. If the father by his immoral conduct has become a person unfit, in the eyes of every one, to perform his duties to his child and to claim the rights of a father towards his child, then, if the child be a ward of Court—for otherwise the Court has no jurisdiction whatever—in such cases the Court will interfere. So, also, if the father has allowed certain things to be done, and then, by capricious change of purpose, has ordered the contrary, to the injury of the child, the Court will not allow that capricious change of mind to take effect, though if the thing had been done originally, the Court could not have interfered. I am not prepared to say whether, when the child is a ward of Court, and the conduct of the father is such as to exhaust all patience—such, for instance, as cruelty or pitiless spitefulness carried to a great extent—the Court might not interfere. But such interference will be exercised only in the utmost need, and in most extreme cases. It is impossible to lay down the rule of the Court more clearly than has been done by Vice-Chancellor Bacon in the recent case of "Re Plowley" (47 "L. T.," N.S., 283). In saying that this Court, "whatever be its authority or jurisdiction, has no authority to interfere with the sacred right of a father over his own children," the learned Vice-Chancellor has summed up all that I intended to say. The rights of the father are sacred rights, because his duties are sacred; but the rights of the testamentary guardian are legal rights, and legal rights only. With those sacred rights the Court has not interfered, and will not interfere, unless the conduct of the father has been such as to give the Court that authority. If the father has been guilty of gross immorality, so as to make it improper that he should be guardian of any child, or if he is influenced by wicked, causeless caprice, which must be detrimental to the interests of the child, then the Court will interfere to prevent contamination or injury. It seems to me in this case that there is no charge made against the father of conduct such as would authorise the Court in interfering. If it had been stated or made to appear that the father had refused his consent for the purpose of exercising any further pressure on his daughter to induce her to change her religion, there would have been that capricious change of purpose which would have called for the interference of the Court. It was not alleged in the petition that this strange insistence on the part of the father, for the sake, as it is alleged, of preserving the affections of the child, was done for the purpose of exercising any pressure upon the daughter as to her religion. However strange it may appear to us, that is a matter which the Court certainly cannot inquire into, but we must act on the general rule, and say that, on account of the general credit which the law gives to the natural affection of the father, this case is not within any of the rules which authorise the Court to interfere. The petition must, therefore, be dismissed. Though I should certainly have been disposed to dismiss the petition without costs, if costs were asked for I do not see how they could be refused.

Lords Justices Cotton and Bowen gave judgment to the same effect, observing that if they were not in a court of law, and were capable of being moved by feelings of favour or disfavour, they might be tempted to comment with more or less severity upon the way in which, so far as the case had been presented to them, the father was exercising his paternal right.

In the result the appeal was dismissed, with costs, and the application of Miss Agar-Ellis to be allowed to visit her mother during her summer holidays is refused.

PRIVILEGES OF MARRIED WOMEN.

Under this heading the following paragraph appears in a Manchester newspaper:—At the Bolton County Court, on August 22nd, Messrs. Cooper Brothers, Deansgate, Bolton, sued Ellen Duty, a married woman, carrying on business as a dressmaker, with her husband's sanction, for £3. 15s., the value of a "casing" machine supplied to her and alleged to be a necessity in her business, as it was a labour-saving machine.—The Judge said there might be fifty labour-saving machines introduced into the business of a dressmaker, and if a husband was to be held liable for all the novelties in labour-saving machinery because a wife whom he allowed to carry on business separately from him chose to order them, he might be ruined. He was not prepared to say that a sewing machine was a necessity to a woman carrying on business in such circumstances, though he would not then state his opinion upon that point. The plaintiffs employed touters to get orders for these machines, and it was a very disreputable way of doing business. If they had confined themselves to supplying needles and thread to the defendant, without consulting the husband, they would have been within their rights, but they were not entitled to supply such machinery to married women carrying on business in this way, and for which their touters obtained orders, without getting the husband's sanction. There would be a verdict for defendant with costs.

DEATH OF THE QUEEN OF MADAGASCAR.

A telegram has just been received at the London Missionary Society House which states that the Queen of Madagascar died on July 13th. Order and quiet prevail in the capital and central provinces. Queen Ranovalomanjaka II. succeeded to the throne of Madagascar on the death of Queen Rasoherina on April 1st, 1868. As she was known to be in favour of progress her accession was generally hailed with satisfaction. After she had been elected queen she adopted the Christian religion. The late queen, while her deceased predecessor lay in state, read portions from an old Bible, which for some time lay on a table in the palace. From perusal of the book the queen decided to embrace the faith, for which many distinguished people of her country had suffered loss of life. Her coronation was marked by the absence of idols and other symbols of heathenism, and the canopy above her throne was inscribed with scriptural quotations. The voluntary destruction of idolatrous practices, by which vast numbers of innocent people were slaughtered, followed her accession. One evil practice was the sacrifice of children born on "unlucky" days by placing them at the entrance to a cattle pen, when, if the child was passed over unhurt, it was preserved, as this was regarded as a token of good luck. The queen, being of a kind and intelligent nature, was greatly distressed by persecutions which had occurred in the past, and in the sight of her palace. The suburb of Farvohika was on the north side of the capital, and there four personages of noble birth were burned to death, while in the distant south were regions of pestilential malaria, which had been fatal to many members of distinguished families. It was Queen Ranovalomanjaka's wish to suppress idolatry, which had borne such evil results, and to substitute for it something better, and from her accession until her death she has been strictly faithful to the welfare of her people. Under her sway education made rapid advances, and in the principal schools in the provinces there were about 140,000 scholars. Frequently the Queen displayed her interest in this work by personally distributing prizes at the schools. According to the native law all the men in Madagascar are liable to government service in lieu of taxes. The Queen enacted, however, that teachers and others occupied in education should be exempt from such service. Other reforms which she made involved the extinction of vested interests. Officers were accustomed to secure to themselves the services of men of lower grade, and many had thus acquired command of 1,000 subordinates, but by a new law 30 was the maximum number allowed to the highest officers in the country. This reform was hailed with general satisfaction. Great reforms were introduced in the army, and the system of life service was abolished, the longest period of service now required being five years. Many reforms in the administration of justice have likewise been made, the old system being rotten and corrupt. Legislation was frequently kept pending for years, bribery was common, and suitors being unable to pay costs were in consequence sold into slavery. Under the new system the decisions formerly resting with the judges were placed in the hands of a jury of 12 officers and a chief judge. The late Queen has laid the foundations of constitutional government in Madagascar, and important offices which she established are now held by native gentlemen educated in college at Antananarivo. In 1877 Queen Ranovalomanjaka effected the emancipation of all Mozambique slaves in her dominions, and the importation of slaves was rendered illegal. Though domestic slavery still exists, it has been shorn of its worst features, and the public slave markets have been abolished.

The subject of chief importance and of deepest anxiety is the person who may be nominated and elected as successor to the deceased Queen. There are two ladies who have been named for the supreme authority, one of whom has had a special training fitting her to fill the position with dignity and efficiency, and to act the part of a constitutional monarch. But, considering the critical position of the Government, owing to the French occupation, and the possible weakening of the influence of the Prime Minister or the strengthening of the opposition, speculation as to the probable course of events is entirely at fault. Telegrams are hourly expected announcing the accession of the new ruler.

Among the testimonials just awarded by the Royal Humane Society is one to Lily Kellett, a little girl seven years of age, for the rescue from drowning of her brother, J. Kellett. The girl also made a gallant attempt to rescue another child.

MISS ANTHONY IN EDINBURGH.

A meeting of the friends of women's suffrage was held at 5, St. Andrew Square, Edinburgh, on July 26, with a view of doing honour to Miss Susan B. Anthony, leader of the cause in the United States. The attendance was very good, among those present being Professor Blackie, the Rev. Dr. Adamson, the Rev. Mr. Henderson, the Rev. R. B. Drummond, Mr. and Mrs. Wellstood, Dr. Agnes M'Laren, Misses Eliza and Louisa Stevenson, Maitland, Burton, Ramsey, Smith, Simpson, Hunter, Espinasse, Richardson, Dublin; Mrs. Kirk, Mrs. Patterson, Mrs. R. Moor, London; Mrs. Robertson, Portobello; Mr. David and Mrs. Lewis. After a service of tea, Mrs. Nichol, who occupied the chair, briefly introduced Miss Anthony, who gave an interesting sketch of the history of the movement for women's suffrage in America, and the progress of many questions concerning the condition of women and their social and literary condition. At the close of the address, Professor Blackie said he only objected to the extension of the suffrage to women, because he disapproved of introducing gentle, refined women into the muddy waters of politics. Dr. Adamson, the Rev. Mr. Henderson, the Rev. Mr. Drummond, Mr. D. Lewis, Miss Burton, Mrs. Kirk, Mrs. Wellstood, and Miss Maitland also took part in the proceedings. Votes of thanks were accorded to Miss Anthony for her address, to Mrs. Nichol for presiding, and to the Ladies' Committee for arranging the reception.

NATIVE LADY LAWYERS AND DOCTORS IN INDIA.

According to a statement published in a Madras paper Mrs. Ethirajulu, a native lady, has been granted permission by Mr. Nayadu, B.A., a sub-magistrate, to practise in his court as a private pleader. The new practitioner is described as "the wife of the Rev. S. Ethirajulu, whom native Christians of Madras may still remember," and as "a lady talking English very fluently and charmingly, and European-like in her habits, except in her dress." It appears that at present Mrs. Ethirajulu is keeping a private girls' school in the city. The *Indian Daily News* also states that a native lady has already been enrolled as a pupil in the primary class of the Medical College Hospital, Calcutta.—*Western Daily News*, August 13, 1883.

MEDICAL WOMEN FOR INDIA.

Mrs. Scharlieb, M.B. and B.S. (London), had the honour of being received by the Queen at Windsor before taking her departure for Madras, where she intends to practise as a physician. Mrs. Scharlieb lived at Madras for some years before coming to England to enter the London School of Medicine for Women, with a view to enhancing the qualification already possessed by her for medical practice. On the completion of her school career she took the scholarship and gold medal in midwifery at the examinations of the London University, as well as honours in medicine, forensic medicine, and surgery. During her interview with the Queen, Her Majesty made many inquiries about the condition of the native female populations of India, and was much interested in what Mrs. Scharlieb was able, from personal experience, to tell her as to the need of medical women in that country. At the conclusion of the visit, the Queen, of her own accord, presented Mrs. Scharlieb, with her likeness, and desired her to tell the women of India of all classes that she was much interested in hearing about them and that they had her fullest sympathy.

Miss Arabella Kenealy, second daughter of the late Dr. Kenealy, has taken her degree in the College of Physicians, Dublin, coming out first in order of merit over the 50 candidates competing. Two of these were ladies, Miss Cradock and Miss Andrews. Miss Kenealy offered her services to the Foreign Office to proceed at once to the seat of cholera in Egypt in order to extend medical aid among women who were not permitted to see a male doctor. As the cholera is now decreasing Lord Granville considered that her services would not be necessary.

Mr. Tong Sing, a Chinese gentleman, has sent £10 to the London School of Medicine for Women. He says it would be a blessing if Chinese ladies were taught that profession.

THE ELECTION OF A VICAR.

The *Western Daily Press*, July 5th, says, "A unique mode of choosing a vicar was practised on Sunday at Sandford, a village near Crediton, Devon. By an old charter, the power of selecting their spiritual adviser is vested in the parishioners in this wise:—Upon a vacancy arising in the living, the three Church governors for the parish nominate whom they please for the appointment, but the parishioners can either ratify or veto the selection. The vicar of the parish (Rev. C. Gregory), who has held the living since 1836, has recently died, and after his funeral the choice of the parishioners for a successor fell almost unanimously upon the Rev. G. Llewellyn, who had for upwards of two years discharged the duties of curate. Upon the vacancy becoming known there were sixty applications for the living, which is worth £350 a year, with some glebe. From these three gentlemen were selected to read on different Sundays to the congregation—Rev. G. Llewellyn, the Rev. Mr. Veysey, and the Rev. T. J. C. Gardner, of Bardsley. The choice of the governors ultimately fell upon the latter gentleman, and notice was given the parishioners that the election would take place on Sunday after the afternoon service. There was accordingly a crowded congregation. After the service Colonel Davie expressed regret at the absence through illness of the two other church governors (Sir H. F. Davie and Mr. E. Tremlett), and said that the governors had given their best attention to the matter and did not wish to bias the electors in the slightest respect—the choice rested with them, and they should exercise their rights freely. The election was then proceeded with. The mode adopted was that as the parishioners filed out of the principal entrance, each (women as well as men voting) exclaimed 'Assent' or 'Dissent,' and the vote was registered accordingly. At the close of the voting it was found that only five had voted in favour of the governors' nomination, while there were 215 against. It is not known what the next step will now be. The governors may again nominate a vicar, but the parishioners have to ratify the choice. Should the ratepayers refuse to elect the governors' nominee, the bishop may, after six months, nominate a person, but even then the parishioners have the same power."

THE DEAN OF WELLS ON THE MINISTRY OF WOMEN.

At the first annual meeting of the Bath and Wells Lay Helpers' Association, held at the Cathedral on July 26th, the Dean of Wells read a paper on "The Ministry of Women." He said:—It seems the conventionally right thing to say on this, as a topic of the day, that the highest ministry of women is the ministry of home; that wifehood and motherhood are the crown, almost the limit of her functions in the body politic. We have heard this repeated with a wearisome iteration against every claim for the recognition of woman's rights or the extension of her duties. Like all such conventional utterances it has an element of divine truth in it. . . . Step by step the conventional prejudice of which I speak has had to give way before the advance of truer and more Christian thought. Women may be poor-law guardians and may sit on school boards. . . . Many forms of such work have already obtained recognition. Women may be Sunday school teachers and district visitors without incurring the reproach of being unfeminine. Here, at least, we do not shrink back, as from some dangerous spectre, from the outward garb of the deaconess or the sister. We are beginning to recognise that their labours among the sick and poor should be more organised, and clothed with a more definite authority,—that the polity of the Church is not complete without them. But each of these, it must be remembered, has had to struggle in its day against the prejudices of invincible ignorance and the tenacity of routine. I should not be surprised if what I am about to propose should give a fresh shock to those respectable prepossessions. That proposal is simply that we should recognise and foster, on a far wider scale than at present, the teaching functions of women in the ministry of the Church of Christ. I do this on the broad grounds that they have often, in large measure, the gifts of teaching, and that the Spirit who bestows those gifts did not give them to be wasted. The principle of a "*carriere ouverte aux talents*" holds good here also. I cannot see why a woman who might teach men and women should be confined to exercise that power upon boys and girls only. . . . To neglect that influence is, I venture to think, from one point, an economical blunder, as a waste of material and of force, and from another, as little less than the sin of wrapping up the talent which God has given in the napkin of a conventional routine instead of occupying with it, till the Judge shall come, in the market of the souls of men. Are we to recognise the stage and the concert room as a fit sphere for the display of a woman's gifts of genius and culture, and then serenely exclude her from the mission-room and the platform because that would be at variance with the natural modesty of her sex? . . . After alluding to St. Paul's prohibition of women from teaching, he asked if St. Paul gave a special direction as to the outward dress of women who prayed and prophesied, did it not imply that they might, under those circumstances, prophesy—that was, speak words of comfort and counsel as the spirit gave them utterance? . . . For my part, I find it hard to imagine that Priscilla, who expounded the way of God more perfectly even to Apollos—as Elizabeth Fry or Hannah More may have done to a Georgian bishop—was altogether a mute person when the Church in her house was gathered together so that one might edify another. And even if the prohibition were as absolute as you imagine, what proof have you that it was intended to be binding for all time, and not rather to take its place among the things that might be varied from time to time by the wisdom of the Church, according to the diversity of countries, times, and men's manners. I can well imagine that a man of St. Paul's cautious and temperate wisdom would have been slow to sanction what would have clashed with the prepossessions of his converts. But in the history of his own people there were precedents of another character. It was characteristic of Hebrew nations, as it was afterwards of that Teutonic race which gave a fresh life to a decayed and corrupted Christendom, that they recognised God's gifts as bestowed on women for the guidance of His people. The long succession of prophetesses—Miriam, Deborah, the wife of Isaiah, Huldah, Anna—which had been the glory of Israel, was that to have no counterpart in the new Israel of the Church of Christ? Even, as it was, I find in the Councils of the early Church, a full recognition of the teaching functions of women in relation to their own sex, and even of men elsewhere than in the public assemblies of the Church. As new elements of life began to develop themselves, I note the influence of Hilda in our own English Church, presiding over a monastery, not of women only, but of men, training them in the knowledge of Scripture, publicly and privately, and in the pastoral office, so that Bishops went to receive their candidates for orders from what was practically a Theological College under a Lady Principal. In the fourteenth century we have in St. Catherine of Siena one who directed the policy of Popes, harangued them in the presence of the Cardinals, and was consulted by divines on abstruse questions of theology; who was admitted to the third order of the Dominican or preaching friars, laboured for the salvation of souls, and guided in the way of righteousness those whom she had converted. It lies in the nature of the case that those women who suffered in the Reformation struggles—Joan Boucher, Ann Askew, and others—had made themselves conspicuous by the influence which they exercised over the minds of disciples as well as by private heretical opinions of their own. The influence of the Abbesses, and Nuns of Portroyal, and of the Regents or teachers who were sent by Nicholas Pavillon, Bishop of Alet, to instruct those of their own sex, and who were welcomed by little children, and blessed by the roughest peasants with tears in their eyes, is another example of the organised employment of what we are content to waste. I do not, of course, in offering this suggestion, claim a full license for the utterance of every thought suggested by earnestness, or genius, or wisdom. God is not the author of confusion, but of order, as in all the Churches of the Saints. What I ask is, that the barriers of conventional usage which keeps them from any exercise of their gifts should be removed, and that deaconesses and Bible women should be placed on the same footing as deacons once were, and as lay readers are. Training, examination, the consent of the Incumbent, the Bishop's license, all these I should contend for in the case of women as of men. . . . What I have said may perhaps startle and offend now. I do not despair of its being within half a century accepted, acted on, regarded as a common-place truism. The past is in this respect the earnest of the future. Even Sunday School Teachers, and Deaconesses, and Sisters of Mercy, have had their martyrs and confessors. The devout lady of Barleywood (Mrs. Hannah More), when she opened a school for children and Bible classes for adults, was charged by the farmers and the clergy of the neighbourhood with stepping out of her sphere, encouraging rebellion, dishonesty, and immorality; her writings were fit to be burned by the common hangman. Miss Sellon and her fellow-workers were the objects of the savage hatred of mobs at Plymouth. As it is, we have learnt, as usual, to build the sepulchres of the prophets while we repeat the blunders of those who stoned them. But truth is mighty and will at last prevail, and in this, as in other things, the age to come will think with those who have seemed to their own generation as the preachers of a dream.

THE EARL OF DERBY ON THE OFFICIAL DUTIES OF WOMEN.

At the Lord Mayor's banquet to Her Majesty's Ministers at the Guildhall, on August 8, the Earl of Derby proposed the health of the "Lady Mayoress." He said that all who had had the duty of selecting men for high employments, such as ambassador, governor, or head of department, knew that one of the first questions they asked respecting a candidate was "What sort of a wife has he got? Will she help him in discharging that which is not the least important part of his duty—namely, the social part?"

WOTTON-UNDER-EDGE.

THE LIBERAL ASSOCIATION.—A committee meeting of the Wotton-under-Edge and Hawkesbury District Liberal Association was held at the Town Hall on Friday evening, Mr. Llewellyn White in the chair, the business being to discuss the clauses of the proposed new Reform Bill, and a communication from Mr. Symonds, of the National Reform Union Association of Manchester, thereon. A reply to Mr. Symonds' letter was drawn up and approved by the meeting, and it likewise agreed that a petition in favour of the Women's Suffrage Bill should be presented to the House of Commons.

LOCAL BOARDS.

DALTON-IN-FURNESS.

A petition in favour of the Parliamentary franchise to women who possess the qualification to vote in local government was adopted by the District Local Board of Dalton-in-Furness at a meeting held in June.

WALTON-ON-THE-HILL.

At a meeting held in July the Local Board, Walton-on-the-Hill, Surrey, adopted and forwarded to Mr. Hugh Mason a petition in favour of women's suffrage.

WHITWOOD.

At a meeting of the Whitwood Local Board, held at Whitwood Mere, Castleford, Yorkshire, a petition in favour of Mr. Mason's resolution was adopted and sealed by the Board.

HASTINGS.

On August 29th Miss Müller, member of the London School Board, delivered a lecture on "Woman: Her Relation to Church and State," in the Queen's Avenue Assembly Rooms, Hastings. The chair was occupied by Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell. The room was quite full and the lecture was very well received. After some observations from Mrs. Tubbs and others, the usual votes of thanks concluded the proceedings.

BRISTOL AND WEST OF ENGLAND.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS, FROM JULY 20 TO AUGUST 20, 1883.

	£	s.	d.
Mr. Sommerville	4	0	0
Mrs. W. H. Budgett	1	1	0
Mrs. Thomas Thomas	1	1	0
Mr. Whibly	1	1	0
Miss Yardley	1	0	0
Miss Hall (Redland)	0	10	0
Misses Marriott	0	10	0
Miss G. Thomas	0	10	0
Mrs. Eubulus Williams	0	10	0
Mr. Lloyd	0	5	0
Mrs. Walter Sturge	0	5	0
Mr. J. G. Thornton	0	5	0
Mr. Dyke Smith (Cheltenham)	0	2	6
Mrs. Thornton	0	2	6
GLOUCESTER.			
Dr. Bond	0	5	0
Mrs. Ward	0	5	0
Miss Fonracre	0	2	6
Mrs. Herbert Simpson	0	2	6
	£11	18	0

ALICE GRENFELL, TREASURER, 1, Cecil Road, Clifton.

MANCHESTER SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS, AUGUST, 1883.

	£	s.	d.
Mr. Henry Lightbown	3	3	0
Mr. Wm. Mather	2	2	0
Mrs. Theo. Fry	2	0	0
Mr. Thos. Chorlton	1	1	0
Dr. Muirhead	1	1	0
Mr. A. Howarth	1	1	0
Mrs. Lodge	1	1	0
Miss Birrell	1	0	0
Mrs. Stanley Cary	1	0	0
Mrs. N. Pearce-Sharman	1	0	0
Mr. C. P. Clark (Wolverh'pton)	0	10	6
Mr. Alderman Worthington	0	10	6
Mr. R. Gill	0	10	0
Miss M. A. Finch	0	5	0
Miss Beevor	0	5	0
Miss G. Mackenzie	0	5	0
Mrs. Blott	0	5	0
Miss Edith Dulley	0	5	0
Mr. Jas. Little	0	5	0
Messrs. Ritchie and Eason	0	5	0
Miss R. Whitelegge	0	5	0
Mr. Jas. Grundy	0	5	0
Mr. M. Ridgway	0	5	0
Mrs. Whitwell Wilson	0	5	0
Mr. Jas. Heap (Burnley)	0	2	6
Mr. E. Partridge	0	2	6
Miss Martin	0	2	6
Mrs. Wm. Booth (Hyde)	0	2	6
Mr. W. H. Carr	0	2	6
Mrs. Addison	0	2	6
Miss Nuttall	0	2	6
LEEK.			
Mr. Stephen Goodwin	0	10	0
Mr. Arthur Nicholson	0	10	0
Mr. Joshua Brough	0	5	0
Mr. Wm. Sugden	0	5	0
Mr. Thos. Shaw	0	5	0
"W. R. A."	0	2	6
HANDLEY.			
Mr. Ambrose Bevington	0	10	6
Messrs. T. and R. Gillman	0	10	6
Mr. J. Shenton	0	5	0
Mr. J. Cranner, J.P.	0	5	0
Mrs. T. Worthington	0	2	6
Mr. J. Lowe	0	2	6
Mr. Wood	0	1	6
LICHFIELD.			
Mr. Charles Simpson	1	0	0
Mr. Gillard	0	2	6
WARSALL.			
Mr. Ald. Holden, J.P.	1	1	0
Mr. Job Wilkes	0	5	0
Mr. Joseph Dixon	0	5	0
Mr. Jas. A. Aldis	0	5	0
Mr. Thos. Kirby	0	2	6
Mr. Jonathan Ellis	0	2	6
Mr. Bates	0	1	6
BOSTON.			
Mr. Ald. Wright	0	10	0
Mr. Ald. Maltby	0	5	0
Dr. Small, J.P.	0	2	6
Miss Wood	0	2	6
STAFFORD.			
Mr. Ald. Silvester, J.P.	0	5	0
Mr. Ald. Kelsall, J.P.	0	5	0
Mr. John Allwood	0	5	0
Mrs. Gibson	0	5	0
Mr. J. Hadley	0	2	6
Mr. J. T. Cox	0	2	6
M. D. (Mrs. Duncan)	0	2	6
DUDLEY.			
Mr. James Whyte	0	2	6
Mrs. Thompson	0	2	6
Mrs. Turner	0	2	6
Mrs. Crew	0	2	6
Mr. J. Ridgway	0	2	6
KIDDERMINSTER.			
Mr. Miller Corbet	0	5	0
Mr. Ald. Holloway	0	5	0
Mrs. G. Turton	0	2	6
Mr. J. P. Harvey	0	2	6
Mr. A. W. Beale	0	2	6
Mr. Will Brooke	0	2	6
CHESTERFIELD.			
Mr. J. Stores Smith	1	1	0
Mrs. Swanwick	1	1	0
Mrs. Bingham	1	0	0
Mr. T. Pearson	0	5	0
Miss Pearson	0	5	0
Mrs. Parker	0	5	0
Mr. J. Higginbotham	0	3	0
Miss Booth	0	2	6
Mr. B. Douglas	0	2	6
Mr. W. B. Robinson	0	2	6
Miss Jeffries	0	2	6
Miss Fox	0	2	6
Miss Pike	0	2	6
Mrs. Limb	0	1	6
NEWARK.			
Mr. Mackenzie	0	5	0
Mr. Crossley	0	5	0
"Neutral" (2 years)	0	5	0
Mr. R. Henry	0	2	6
Mr. Saunders	0	2	6
RETFORD.			
Mr. B. Haigh	0	5	0
Mr. W. Hindley	0	5	0
Mr. W. Antcliff	0	2	6
HULL.			
Rev. John Hunter	0	10	0
Mr. E. Elam	0	5	0
Dr. Lamb	0	5	0
Mr. Alfred Frost	0	5	0
Mr. Cohen	0	5	0
Mrs. S. E. Gregson	0	2	6
Mr. Thomas Haller	0	2	6
Dr. Fraser	0	2	6
Mr. B. Tongue	0	2	6
Mr. H. Robinson	0	2	6
Mrs. J. M. Dixon	0	2	6
The Misses Brown	0	2	6
	£39	9	0

S. ALFRED STEINTHAL, TREASURER, 28, Jackson's Row, Manchester.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS, FROM JULY 28 TO AUGUST 28, 1883.

	£	s.	d.
Mr. Streatfield (Gomshall)	10	0	0
Mr. and Mrs. Fawcett	5	0	0
Mrs. Ashton Dilke	5	0	0
Mrs. Slous	2	2	0
Miss Ruth	2	0	0
Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Streatfeild (Upper Norwood)	1	1	0
Mrs. Joseph Allen	1	1	0
Mrs. Bateson	1	1	0
The Rev. R. Shaen	1	1	0
Mrs. Slack	1	1	0
Mr. J. Wates	1	1	0
Mrs. Joseph Crook	1	1	0
Miss M. Austen Legh	1	0	0
Miss Finch	1	0	0
Mrs. T. Shaw	0	10	6
Mr. H. Selfe Leonard	0	10	6
Miss Rawlinson	0	10	0
Miss Fenwick	0	10	0
Dr. Roth	0	10	0
Mr. Orr	0	6	0
Miss Haubury	0	5	0
Miss Vincent	0	5	0
Mrs. Septimus Buss	0	5	0
Miss Janion	0	5	0
Mr. T. Wilson	0	5	0
Mrs. Stobart	0	5	0
Mrs. M'Roberts	0	5	0
Miss Clodd	0	2	6
Mrs. Bridell Fox	0	2	6
Mrs. Bevington	0	2	6
Mrs. Rudd	0	2	6
Miss H. Veitch Brown	0	2	6
Miss Thomson	0	2	6
Miss Mayo	0	2	0
Mrs. Brookbank	0	2	0
Miss Samson	0	1	0
Mrs. Brown	0	1	0
Collected at Mrs. Fenwick			
Miller's Lectures:			
Worthing	1	2	0
Littlehampton	0	9	0
	£40	13	0

LAURA M'LAREN, TREASURER, 29, Parliament-street, S.W.

Printed by A. IRELAND & Co., Pall Mall, Manchester, for the Proprietors, and Published by Messrs. Trübner and Co., 57 and 59, Ludgate Hill, London, and Mr. JOHN HEYWOOD, Manchester.—September 1, 1883.—Entered at Stationers' Hall.