

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

VOL. VI.—No. 66. PUBLISHED MONTHLY.
REGISTERED FOR TRANSMISSION ABROAD.

AUGUST 2, 1875.

PRICE ONE PENNY.
By POST THREE HALFPENCE.

THE debate on the Household Franchise (Counties) Bill, which took place on July 7th, offers some points of interest in reference to the Bill which we may paraphrase as the Household Franchise (Women) Bill. The debate was opened by Mr. SALT, who, in opposing the measure, said that "the agricultural labourer had the same right, and the same claim, which every other person in this country had, whether man, woman, or child. He had a right to free government, and to sound, well-ordered legislation." We thank the honourable gentleman for the concession that women as well as men have a right to free government, and we trust that when next the question of the electoral rights of women comes before the House of Commons, he will perceive that, although free government may possibly be compatible with accidental exclusion from the franchise owing to the lack of a technical legal qualification, it is not compatible with express and specific disfranchisement notwithstanding the possession of this qualification.

Mr. FORSTER said "I am still of opinion that we shall arrive at the best attainable government, at present, and for some time to come, by restricting the franchise to householders, and retaining what is called a hearthstone suffrage instead of giving a vote to every man. In the present state of society, it is better to confine the franchise to men who are heads of families, and who have a stake in the country." Mr. FORSTER has never yet voted against giving the franchise to women who are heads of families, and who have a stake in the country, and it is evident that the principle of "hearthstone suffrage" would be greatly strengthened by giving a vote to the representative and head of every household in town or country. A woman who maintains herself and her family, often under much greater difficulties than a man would have to contend with, and who, as head of the household, is personally responsible to the State for the taxation imposed upon it, ought to be deemed equally worthy of a vote with the man who does no more, and more eligible than the man who has not assumed these responsibilities. That qualification seems peculiarly suited for women, which is based on the maintenance of the domestic hearth.

Mr. FORSTER said that the argument that "the great

object is the good government of the country" would not satisfy the men who were asking for votes, "for they feel, as they ought to feel, that they have suffered in practical legislation because they have no votes." Women feel this, and are made to feel it in every session of Parliament by the failure of measures to relieve their wrongs, and by fresh encroachments on their personal liberty in the way of penalties and restrictions on them for things which in men are free. They also feel, as Mr. FORSTER says the agricultural labourers feel, "that their interests are, not intentionally neglected, but at least lost sight of." He goes on to say, "for anything I know, a good many agricultural labourers may vote against us; but, of all considerations which should influence public men, I think that of the immediate party effect of a measure is the one we ought to entertain least. I think honesty is the best policy in this as in other matters, and that party will gain in the long run which earnestly advocates a good measure."

The next sentence of Mr. FORSTER'S speech, if we substitute "women" for "agricultural labourers," exactly and happily describes what has taken place in our agitation. "We may be told there is not much agitation or pressure for this measure. I do not know that the people who have votes care so much for it as they ought; but we have no reason to suppose that those who have not votes do not care. The meetings of [agricultural labourers], which are most interesting meetings, show us a new class taking part in public affairs with great moderation and earnestness, and avowing that injustice will be done them if a settlement of the question is longer postponed, and the petition presented to-day, signed by 60,000 labourers, is not a petition to be lightly treated." Many more meetings have been held by women in claiming electoral rights than by labourers, and the speakers at these meetings are at least as worthy of attention as if they were peasants and ploughmen, while not 60,000, but about 300,000 women have petitioned for the franchise. Moreover the boasted 60,000 signatures dwindled to 38,917 in the report of the Committee on Public Petitions, who also reported that many of the names were in the same handwriting, and

that it appeared that the rules of the House requiring the signatures to be in the handwriting or mark of the signers had not been complied with. Mr. BRIGHT, who presented the petition, explained that although the names had been written by others, the petition was a genuine one, because the persons had assented to it; but if women permitted themselves to get up petitions in this way, instead of insisting on autograph signatures, they might easily have doubled or trebled the number of names. They have, however, not so far forgotten the respect due to the House of Commons as to knowingly promote or send up petitions not in accordance with its rules. The total number of signatures presented for the two Bills is, for Mr. TREVELYAN'S Bill, 68 petitions with an aggregate of 48,797 signatures; for Mr. FORSYTH'S Bill, 1,273 petitions with 415,622 signatures.

Mr. TREVELYAN said that "the present session afforded ample proof that in a representative government the more we extended the representation, the classes which still remained excluded from the suffrage went only the more hopelessly and the more rapidly to the wall." Since those words were spoken they have received a remarkable illustration in the fate of the Merchant Shipping Bill, designed to protect the lives of seamen. A contemporary explains the preference given by the Government to the Agricultural Holdings Bill by the simple formula "sailors have no votes." A similar reason suffices to account for the failure of the HOME SECRETARY'S Offences Against the Person Bill, which was more especially intended to protect women from brutal violence at the hands of men.

The labourers in counties, says Mr. TREVELYAN, are told to be content because their interests were sufficiently represented by the farmers, the landlords, and the freeholders. So women are told that their interests are sufficiently represented by men. "But," continues the member for the Border Burghs, "the very essence of the theory of representation was that the represented should be able to call the representatives to account, and how was it possible for non-electors to influence electors, to criticise, to encourage, to remonstrate with them on the manner in which they exercise the suffrage, when under a system of secret voting no one could tell on which side that suffrage was given. The Ballot Act of 1872 cut away the very ground from beneath the feet of those who relied on the worn-out theory of vicarious representation."

"In the recent election for West Suffolk a gentleman whose chances had at first seemed not unfavourable, was

beaten out of the field as soon as it began to be put about that he was 'ARCH'S candidate,' that is to say that he was willing to give a respectful consideration to the claims and wishes of the non-electors." Similarly, we may say that Mr. JACOB BRIGHT was supposed to have been placed at a disadvantage in the last election for Manchester, because he had undertaken to represent and defend the interests of women. It may be, and probably is true, as he himself declared, that other causes much more general operated to make the changes that were made both in Manchester and elsewhere at the last general election. But it is certain that women who had the deepest interest and the strongest concern in the election of one who had distinguished himself by his fearless and powerful advocacy of the claim for political and legal justice, not for women only, but for all the more helpless and defenceless members of the community, felt it necessary, in the interests of the cause they had at heart, to refrain from the slightest public expression of sympathy, and found that they could only damage the success of the candidate they favoured by attempting to "influence" the constituency in his support. It is also true that Sir THOMAS BAZLEY, who steadily supported his former colleague, by invariably voting for the enfranchisement of women, has so far yielded to the influence of men as to withdraw his support and join the anti-women's suffrage crusade.

Mr. TREVELYAN says, in words which we will leave our readers to paraphrase for themselves, "It is a very serious reflection, that in order to have a hope of sitting as representative of a county, a candidate was under the necessity of carefully concealing the fact that he had any sympathies or opinions in common with the majority of the inhabitants who lived within its borders."

Speaking of the position of the mining population of our northern counties, Mr. TREVELYAN says they are in "the most extraordinary position of any population in the civilised world." But it is exactly the position of the women householders in boroughs. "They have a voice in choosing the guardians of the poor, they have a voice in choosing the members of the body which looked after their highways, they voted for the School Board, they voted for the Board of Health, they exercised all these high trusts, and they exercised them well and wisely. But when it was a question of electing a member of Parliament they had no more part or power in the matter than the horses which dragged the coals along the tramways of their mines," or the cats which sat upon their hearths. The honourable member concluded with an

appeal to the members of his own party, and entreated them not to take counsel of any petty consideration of Parliamentary strategy and electioneering expediency, but to ask themselves the plain question whether this Bill was in accordance with Liberal principles or whether it was not.

The MARQUIS of HARTINGTON said that in 1867 we had decided once and for ever that without reference to any test of fitness, every man who had to bear the responsibilities of a householder should be invested with the privilege of a vote; also, that he saw no convenience or wisdom in excluding permanently from the exercise of the franchise any class unless it can be shown that they are less fit to exercise it wisely than the class we have enfranchised in boroughs.

On a division the Bill was lost by 166 votes against 268, majority against the Bill 102; a majority much larger than that against the Women's Disabilities Bill. This may be accounted for partly by the fact that ours is not a party question, and excites no party animosity, and partly because it does not involve the further question of a redistribution of seats. But whatever be the cause, the circumstance is full of promise and hope, and should incite us to renewed and energetic efforts to carry Mr. FORSYTH'S Bill.

A NEW phase in the women's suffrage agitation has been developed by the formation, under the chairmanship of the Right Hon. E. P. BOUVERIE, of "a committee of Peers, members of Parliament, and other influential men, for the purpose of maintaining the integrity of the franchise in opposition to the claims for the extension of the Parliamentary suffrage to women." The circular which announces this organisation will be found in another column. The first impression produced by a perusal of this document was that it must have been intended as a jest, but there seems to be no doubt that it is a serious move on the part of the opponents. It therefore behoves us to repress our first inclination to laughter, and to consider what may be its effect on our future prospects. We cannot say we are greatly alarmed, but, at the same time, we feel bound to protest against such action as, to say the least, very unusual. It is now semi-officially announced that the new committee does not propose to promote outdoor organisation or agitation in opposition to the women's suffrage meetings, and that the movement has ended in the appointment of a committee of members of Parliament. Concerted action among parties in the House with

reference to political policy is, of course, legitimate. But that is not quite the same thing as government by Parliamentary committees outside the recognised party lines, and more especially when such committees include persons who are not members of Parliament. The chairman of this particular committee, Mr. BOUVERIE, was rejected by the electors of Kilmarnock in 1874, and since then he has vainly wooed fickle Stroud; but though the electors of that remarkable borough might be supposed to be reduced to hard necessity in the way of eligible candidates, they would not look at Mr. BOUVERIE, although he amiably endeavoured to match the evenly balanced political character of the constituency by announcing himself as the candidate of both political parties at once. Baffled in his endeavours to get into the House, Mr. BOUVERIE determines to work outside, and if he can no longer vote in the magic chamber he can be the chairman of a Parliamentary Committee.

We may naturally ask whether the new organisation is strictly in accordance with the rules of the House. It would seem that the House of Commons should be used as a place of business by members only, and by them only for legislative business. If this principle be disregarded, where must the line be drawn? If it is in order for Mr. BOUVERIE to take the chair at a meeting at the House of Commons for the purpose of resisting the claims of women to the Parliamentary vote, it would surely be equally in order for Mr. JACOB BRIGHT to take the chair at another meeting in the same building for the purpose of promoting such claim. We believe that the House does not recognise any privileges in ex-members over other strangers, and therefore it follows naturally from the precedent set by Mr. BOUVERIE that Mr. JOSEPH ARCH might preside at a third "meeting at the House of Commons" in support of the Bill of the hon. member for the Border Burghs, and a fourth might be got up for the purpose of "maintaining the integrity of the franchise" against the encroachments of the agricultural labourer. Such proceedings might be excusable if there were no opportunity for discussing proposed legislative changes in the regular course of debate, but under the present system of Parliamentary government they would not conduce to the orderly despatch of business, nor to the honour and dignity of the House of Commons.

We also record our protest against the attempt to pre-judge our case. The House of Commons may be compared to a jury which is bound to listen to the arguments and evidence laid before it at the time of trial with unpre-

judiced minds, and to give a verdict on the merits of the case. It would be thought wrong for a certain number of the jurymen to form themselves into a committee for the purpose of influencing the verdict of the rest in a particular direction. The comparison is not wholly sound, because members of Parliament are properly free to allow more general considerations to influence their votes than jurymen, who are tied down by technical rules. But the broad principle is the same; and we conceive that we have a right to ask our legislators, when next they discuss the Bill, to come to its consideration with minds open to conviction, and with discretion free to give effect to their convictions, and to call upon our opponents to meet our Parliamentary advocates in open debate, and not to seek to defeat them by a secret cabal.

ONE of the disabilities of women has just received elucidation by the county magistrates of Macclesfield. Mr. MELLOR, a cotton manufacturer of Bollington, employs a number of women in his card-room. One morning he found they had ceased work and were idling about the room. They kept the machinery standing during Friday, Saturday, and Monday, causing considerable loss and inconvenience. The women allege that they ceased work in order to bring about an understanding whether they were to receive extra pay for the material they were engaged upon, which was very bad. In consequence of the unusual course adopted by the women, Mr. MELLOR summoned them before the magistrates for breach of contract. Here his difficulties began. Some of the women are married, and the law clerk informed him that married women were not liable under the Act, as it had been decided that they could not enter into a contract. He protested against this ruling, but without avail. The ground on which Mr. MELLOR complained is a reasonable one, namely, that the women contracted to do certain work for certain wages, and that it was unfair that they should be at liberty to break the contract at any moment without subjecting themselves to a penalty. But according to the ruling of the Courts the master has no remedy under such circumstances.

This decision shows that cotton manufacturers are to a great extent at the mercy of the married women they employ. If a number of married women in the service of a spinner are to be at liberty to absent themselves whenever they choose, they may stop a whole factory, and cause considerable mischief, not only to their employers, but to their fellow operatives, without running any risk.

But in the event of recurring inconvenience from this cause, masters might refuse to employ married women at all. Thus they would be placed at a disadvantage in the labour market, which would be a great hardship to them, and the disability might possibly ultimately operate as a restraint upon marriage among the working classes. The question is also one of considerable importance to employers. The attention of Parliament has been recently directed to devising the most equitable and efficacious method of enforcing contracts between employers and employed, while the existence of a large class of work-people legally incapable of entering into a contract, and therefore necessarily outside the operation of legislation regulating such contracts, appears to have escaped notice, although the non-performance of their work by the class in question may entail heavy loss on their employers, as was shown in the Bollington case.

IN opposing the second reading of the Women's Disabilities Bill Mr. CHAPLIN protested against the assumption that there is the smallest desire or intention on the part of the Imperial Parliament to do less than justice to women, and he claimed for the Legislature that they are animated by a deep desire to deal out full and even-handed justice to all, be they young or be they old, "or be they of whichever sex they may belong to." The idea which Parliament entertains of justice towards the younger members of the unrepresented sex has just received a striking illustration in the fate of Mr. CHARLEY'S Offences Against the Person Bill, the object of which was to extend to children up to the age of thirteen some shred of legislative protection from the worst evil that can befall them. The Bill passed the House of Commons, and in the House of Lords amendments were introduced by Lord LYTTLETON and Lord STANLEY OF ALDERLEY, for giving further protection to children up to the age of fourteen. Not only were these amendments rejected, but at the recommendation of the Law Lords the protection accorded to children between the ages of twelve and thirteen by the Commons was withdrawn by the Lords, and this amendment now awaits the consideration of the Lower House.

On the third reading of the Bill in the House of Lords, Lord STANLEY OF ALDERLEY drew attention to the fact that girls under thirteen are considered as children of school age under the provisions of the Elementary Education Act, and to the monstrously absurd and inconsistent state of the law, which treats them as children for one purpose, and as adult women for another. He reverted

to the subject on another occasion by asking the Duke of RICHMOND if he were prepared to amend the Education Act, so as to bring it into accordance with other laws, by substituting the words "boys and unmarried women" for "children." The object of this question was to support the omitted clause of the Protection of Children Bill, by drawing out the fact that cases of girls married between the ages of twelve and thirteen are too rare to require consideration, and, therefore, that the protection needed for such girls might be properly extended to them.

Another illustration of this boasted "even-handed justice" has lately been given at an inquest in Leamington, where it was declared that if the father of an illegitimate child failed to make the payment ordered by the magistrates in due course of procedure, and in consequence of such neglect the child died for want of medicine, owing to the inability of the mother through poverty to provide the same, no legal responsibility would have rested on the father, as the law places the care of an illegitimate child, with the duty of providing medicines for it, solely on the mother. Such is the manner in which laws have been made by men for women, or rather against them.

THE following article, from the *Pall Mall Gazette*, is given as an illustration of the prevalent spirit of contemptuous scorn which it is the fashion in some quarters to pour on women. The facts are given fairly enough in the narrative, and they speak for themselves. Had it been the disabled captain's youthful son, instead of his wife, who had exercised control over the ship for fifty-eight days, during which the vessel encountered violent gales and shipped heavy seas, and who had conducted it with its valuable cargo safely into port, the performer of this exploit would have been held up to admiration, and not to ridicule. But because it is a woman who has saved the ship and the lives of her husband and the rest of the crew, a paper which prides itself on being "written by gentlemen for gentlemen," seizes the opportunity of pointing the finger of scorn at the heroine herself and at her whole sex. If this is an example of the "courtesy" which we are told women will forfeit if they obtain votes, the sooner we dispense with it the better:—

"A FEMALE NAVIGATOR.—Among other occupations monopolised by man but admirably adapted for woman is that of navigation. The sea is pre-eminently one of woman's 'spheres.' The roar of the tempest would not drown the clear notes of her musical voice when issuing her orders, and her eye, more watchful than man's, would detect in an instant any flaw in the general arrangements of the vessel which might escape the sheepish glances of the inferior sex. A striking illustration of

woman's capabilities in the seafaring line is afforded by the case of the barque Rebecca Crowell, which left New York on March 6th for Buenos Ayres, but became disabled during a severe gale three days after leaving. Several of the spars and sails were carried away, and the captain and first mate were injured to such an extent that they were confined to their berths the rest of the voyage, and rendered incapable of managing the vessel. There was no other person on board except the captain's wife who understood navigation, and she undertook the task of conducting the barque to its point of destination. The second mate was a young man of twenty years old, able to take the helm, but ignorant of the process of making observations. The captain's wife, therefore, assumed the command of the vessel, took observations, ascertained the latitude and longitude, maintained her place on the bridge, and directed the course of the vessel. After exercising control for fifty-eight days, during which the vessel encountered violent gales and shipped heavy seas, she conducted the vessel with its valuable cargo safely into the port of Buenos Ayres. In this actual impersonation of 'the sweet little angel that sits up aloft to keep watch for the life of poor Jack,' the captain of the Rebecca Crowell has indeed been fortunate in his matrimonial venture. Let us hope he appreciates the treasure he has found at its proper value."

MINUTES OF A MEETING AT THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, 23rd JUNE, 1875.

Present.—The Right Hon. E. P. BOUVERIE, in the chair, and the following Members of Parliament: Right Hon. H. C. Childers, Marquis of Hamilton, Lord Randolph Churchill, Hon. E. Stanhope, Mr. Bentineck, Mr. Beresford Hope, Mr. Chaplin, Mr. Hayter, Sir Henry Holland, Sir Henry James, Mr. Kay-Shuttleworth, Mr. Leatham, Mr. Merewether, Mr. Newdegate, Mr. Raikes, Mr. de Rothschild, Mr. Scourfield, Mr. Whitbread.

Resolved—

I. "That a committee of Peers, Members of Parliament, and other influential men be organised for the purpose of maintaining the integrity of the franchise, in opposition to the claims for the extension of the Parliamentary suffrage to women."

II. "That Mr. E. P. Bouverie be requested to act as chairman, and Lord Claud John Hamilton and Mr. Kay-Shuttleworth as honorary secretaries."

The following members have since joined those named above: Lord Elcho, Right Hon. E. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Right Hon. J. R. Mowbray, Sir Thomas Bazley, Mr. Butt, Mr. Gibson, and Colonel Kingscote.

THE DEFENCE OF THE CONSTITUTION.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

(From the *Standard*.)

Roused to a sense of the peril which threatens their sex and nation, some members of the House of Commons have formed themselves into a committee for the protection of mankind against the encroachments of women. Not content with throwing out Women's Suffrage Bills when they are offered to the House, they have resolved to meet the enemy half way and have organised themselves into a body for "maintaining the integrity of the franchise in opposition to the claims for the extension of the Parliamentary suffrage to women." This new Constitutional party, of which Mr. E. P. Bouverie has been elected leader, has already obtained the support of many distinguished men on either side of the House, including Mr.

Childers, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Sir Henry James, Lord Elcho, Mr. Leatham, Mr. Beresford-Hope, Mr. Butt, Mr. Raikes, &c. What is to be its policy, or by what process it means to uphold the integrity of the franchise, we are not informed. But a committee thus formed cannot intend a mere negative existence. We presume that its members will enter the lists against the feminine champions—that Mr. Bouverie will be pitted against Miss Becker, Mr. Childers take up arms against Miss Garrett, and Sir Henry James turn some of those talents lately devoted to the exposure of Honduras Loans against Miss Ashworth. We may look for a contest of the most exciting kind between adversaries so evenly matched, and in a cause so nearly affecting the interests not only of the Constitution but of the human race. For Liberal leaders out of work we cannot imagine a more wholesome employment. In the shock of battle against the aspiring spinster and the intrusive widow, perhaps they may be able to keep in exercise those weapons which have so long been idle or used only against one another. An anti-woman's rights crusade may still redeem the character of what promises to be a terrible dull autumn. In other ways this counter agitation may serve a useful public end. The women, it must be confessed, have had too much of their own way on the female suffrage question. The talking has been all on one side, and it is not good for woman to speak and not be answered. The contemptuous indifference with which that "piebald miscellany, man," is accustomed to treat the political grievances of his maiden aunt and his mother-in-law, denying the strong-minded even the luxury of a reply, must have wounded the feminine sensibilities in their tenderest part. We answered even the compound householder, we had a reason to give to the lodger when he was outside the franchise; and shall we be less polite to the woman who clamours for admission into the Constitutional fold? She also is our "own flesh and blood." It is hard to see, from the side of the Radical theory which holds that the suffrage is a natural right and the privilege to vote equivalent to the privilege to speak and to move, how women can be excluded from the franchise without at least being told why they are unworthy. And if, for the first time, the women are now met with an active and organised opposition to their demands, they may fairly claim it as a step forward in the movement. When members of Parliament join together in committee to oppose female suffrage, it indicates that there is a certain advance in the cause. In the flutter of excitement which will be created among the sisterhood by the announcement of Mr. BOUVERIE'S committee there will not be all indignation. It is something to have got right honourables arrayed against you in open combat; and we much mistake the temper of the sex if, on the whole, there is not as much satisfaction as anger at the project of the new anti-woman association.

(From the Daily News.)

Man, in the House of Commons, has rallied, it would seem, and called in help from the outer world, to enable him to hold his place in creation. The worm has turned; the stag is at bay—we do not exactly know by what sort of illustration to describe most correctly the defensive movement which has just originated within the precincts of the House of Commons. A society is being formed for the better protection of man against the political claims of women; or perhaps we should say for the suppression of woman's rights. Some of our readers may remember *Punch's* once famous "Brook Green Volunteer," and the brilliant movement accomplished by that devoted soldier when anticipating invasion he formed himself into a solid square and prepared to resist cavalry. There are members of the House of Commons now endeavouring to form themselves into a solid square to resist the claims of women to

a place in politics. A society has been formed under the presidency of a gentleman who was, until the late general election, an influential and authoritative member of the House of Commons. Two secretaries have been chosen, one from this side of the House, and one from that; and a circular has been issued calling upon all the manhood of England to resist the encroachments and the pretensions of women. It is intended, we learn, to press forward the objects of this movement, and to form a defensive association, which is to have its members and its representatives in every class of society. In Hawthorne's "Blythedale Romance" one of the Brook Farm leaders predicts that if women push their claims to political rights too far the stronger sex will at length exert its physical power and scourge its feeble companion back into the place which man has graciously appointed for her. Apparently this prophecy is in a fair way to be realised in this country. It is not indeed proposed, so far as we have heard, that the new society is to use actual force for the suppression of the women's suffrage agitation. But an association of members of Parliament and other men for the purpose of putting down the political claims of women has a considerable likeness to the sort of thing which was predicted in Hawthorne's story. To the ordinary mind it would seem that the best thing members of Parliament who disapprove of women's suffrage could do would be to argue and vote against the motion when it comes up in its yearly course. The spectacle of a great number of members of Parliament and other gentlemen banding together for common protection against the encroachments of women is somewhat ludicrously like that of a flock of frightened sheep huddling together in poor defence against some sudden and supposed danger. It does not seem to us an impressive or a dignified performance. It seems to imply a want of faith by the members of this new association in the strength of their own convictions and even the justice of their cause.

The following appeared in a Surrey paper:—

ANTI-WOMAN'S CRUSADE.

To arms! brave companions, come forward,
In defence of the franchise and laws,
Which are menaced by turbulent women,
Stand firm for our privileged cause!
Though the poor and the feeble implore us
To grant them their logical claim,
They're but daughters and sisters; to give them
Any freedom at all is a shame.

Arm! arm! let us fight for old England,
Let us meet them with jibe and with taunt—
If we grant them a vote, they'll get justice
In everything else that they want.
What if women do pay the same taxes,
And have the same laws to obey,
As men have? Is that any reason
They should have the same privilege, pray?

We have law on our side—we have money—
We have physical force—we can fight.
Why should wives not be kicked by their husbands?
Talk of flogging, indeed! its our right.
Why should girls ask for more education?
We like them, when ignorant, best:
We'll at least keep the funds of the nation
For teaching our boys—that's confessed.

SIR THOMAS BAZLEY AND THE ANTI-WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE COMMITTEE.

The following letters have been addressed by the instructions of the Committee of the Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage, to Sir Thomas Bazley, Bart., M.P., one of the members for the city. It would have been highly satisfactory to have presented both sides of the argument, but although the answers are in reply to a communication on a public and political subject, they are marked private. Since this is denied it can only be suggested that the case is presumably a defective one which will not bear the light:—

Manchester, July 2, 1875.

My dear Sir Thomas Bazley,—I have received from some unknown friend a circular, of which the enclosed is a copy. It purports to emanate from an association of peers and members of Parliament for the purpose of resisting women's suffrage. Some of our friends are inclined to think the circular must be a joke, and this supposition derives colour from the appearance of your name among the promoters. It is of course impossible to suppose that you could have authorised any one to use your name in promoting opposition to a measure which has received your unvarying support ever since it was introduced in the House of Commons, but I should be glad to learn how it happens that this circumstance has occurred, and if it should turn out that such an association is really projected, I earnestly hope that you will take steps for the withdrawal of your honoured name from connection with it.—I am, yours faithfully,
LYDIA E. BECKER.

The reply to this letter was marked private.

July 13th, 1875.

My dear Sir Thomas Bazley,—I have to acknowledge your letter of July 6th. You say that you have "irresistible evidence" that in our municipalities the privilege of voting by women has been greatly abused, and that your proposed change of conduct, with regard to their electoral disabilities, is based on convictions resting on "facts." I beg respectfully to ask you what is the "evidence," and what are the "facts," to which you refer. I think that Manchester at least has no reason to be ashamed of the part which its women citizens have taken in its municipal affairs, and I commend to your attention the enclosed letter, which has been addressed to me by a gentleman who is competent to speak with knowledge and authority on this subject.

I would also beg that your next communication may not be a private one. This is no personal matter, but one which concerns the honour and the interests of the women citizens of Manchester collectively, of persons whom the Legislature has thought fit to entrust with a share in the government of this great city, and in the direction of the educational interests and training of those on whom its future prosperity must depend. It is no light thing that the parliamentary representative of this great body of citizens should deliberately bring against them the charge of having abused their trust in such a manner as to be "inimical to moral and political progress"; and in their name and as one of their body, I call upon you to produce the evidence on which this grave charge is founded.

If this were a matter of mere private opinion, I might be content to let it rest; but you hold towards the body of persons in question a position of public trust, if not of direct political responsibility, and your opinion of them, and actions founded on that opinion, are subjects of public concern. I cannot, however, resist the hope that further reflection may induce you to re-consider the matter, and that when next the question

Why should wives want a separate income?
Let men keep the purse in their hands,
For the family peace is "uprooted,"
When aught but the husband commands.
If women must work for their living,
Let us cripple them all that we can;
And be sure keep all well-paid professions
In the hands of the autocrat—Man.

We are strong, they are weak; and yet somehow
These women will not be denied,
Though they've nothing but justice and reason
And argument all on their side.
Our great Constitution's in danger,
If a woman should vote like a man;
We grant that the Queen is a woman,
But that was no part of our plan.

And another thing, gallant companions;
If the wedge is inserted, though thin,
Our last chance this is to be famous,
As it's certain the women will win.
We had better be known as opponents
Of reason, than not known at all;
So let us collect a committee,
And in the front rank let us fall.

There's Bouverie first as our chairman—
He can talk of "Society's laws";
There's James—to revenge taunts at Taunton
He'll fight to the death in our cause;
There's Childers, and Chaplin the horsy,
And Bazley in whom we have pride—
Seven times he has voted for women,
But now he is trying our side,
There's Newdegate, fearful of Papists,
And Hugessen, too, in the crowd,
To say "Woman's the sweet silver lining
That gilds man's existence's cloud."

And there's Leatham, so proud of his speeches,
Will bring inuendo and jest;
At Huddersfield all that is rubbish,
But Parliament likes it the best.
"If we value our great institutions—
If we don't wish the times out of joint,
Let us have none but 'manly' electors,"
Drunk or vicious—that's not to the point.

Come, men of each creed and each party,
Show manly decision and zeal;
If we want to keep women in order,
We must tread them down well under heel.
They are weak, we are strong—Then how glorious
Our gallant committee will be,
If we lay down the law that men only
Have logical claims to be free!

THE RIGHTS OF WOMEN IN PERU.—A young lady, having completed the necessary studies, applied to the Peruvian Government to ascertain whether her sex would be an obstacle to receive a diploma as Doctor of Laws. The Minister of Justice replied that the Republic placed men and women on the same footing, and that all Peruvians enjoyed equal rights. He added that the Government had great pleasure in making that declaration.—*L'Avenir des Femmes.*

comes before the House of Commons, you will not by your vote on that occasion cast 10,000 of your townswomen the stigma of unworthiness in the exercise of their electoral privileges, but that you will be found as heretofore, supporting a measure based on those principles of justice and freedom, which you rightly say are the foundations of the welfare of every people.—
I am, yours faithfully,
LYDIA E. BECKER.

[Enclosure.]

28, Jackson's Row, July 8, 1875.

Dear Miss Becker,—In answer to your inquiry I do not think the exercise of the franchise by women has been abused. Ever since women have been allowed to vote I have acted as a returning or presiding officer at every School Board election in Manchester and at nearly every municipal election. I have never had a case before me of a drunken woman voter; I do not remember that there was a greater preponderance of illiterates among the women than among the men, and certainly in many cases the intelligence and business manner of recording their votes has left a strong impression on my mind that such women voters knew the value of the privilege they exercised just as well as the men did.—I am, very truly yours,
THOMAS BAKER.

Manchester, July 23, 1875.

My dear Sir Thomas Bazley,—I am instructed by the Committee of the Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage to send copies of my recent correspondence with you to the Manchester papers, and to beg that you will withdraw the word "private" from your letter of July 6th, in order that it may be published along with the rest. I trust that you will agree to this, for the subject is in no sense a private one. Your vote on a question of political justice is a matter of public discussion, and your constituents may reasonably desire to be informed of the grounds on which you base a reversal of the policy you pursued during the late Parliament, and which you were understood to maintain in common with all the other candidates, at the last election for Manchester.—I am, yours faithfully,
LYDIA E. BECKER.

PUBLIC MEETINGS.

LLANDUDNO.

The series of summer lectures on behalf of the Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage was opened on July 16th at Llandudno, by Miss Becker, who addressed a meeting in St. George's Hall. The chair was occupied by Mr. J. M. Davenport, of Oxford—a visitor to Llandudno—who in introducing the lecturer said that the chair was to have been taken by the respected Rector of Llandudno, and two hours before that gentleman was visiting the speaker and his family at their residence on the hill. Being an invalid the Rector left the house in his chair, and in descending the hill the conductor of the chair became overpowered, the Rev. Mr. Morgan was thrown out, and unfortunately dislocated his left shoulder. From his bed of affliction he sent and asked the speaker to preside at Miss Becker's lecture. He stood there that evening committed to no opinion, but on the other hand he was fraught with no prejudice, and was open to conviction. He had to express his deep concern for the unhappy accident which had deprived them of the presence of the respected gentleman, who was to have presided that evening. Miss Becker, who was received with applause, after expressing her regret and concern for the accident, and her thanks to Mr. Davenport for consenting to preside at so short a notice, proceeded to deliver her

address; after which a lady present moved a vote of thanks to Miss Becker, which was seconded by a gentleman and carried. A vote of thanks to the chairman concluded the proceedings. A good report of the lecture appeared in the *Llandudno Directory*.

RHYL.

On July 19th, Miss Becker delivered an address at St. George's Hall, Rhyl. The chair was occupied by the Rev. J. Blake, M.A., of London. The attendance was good, and after the lecture, which was received with much applause, P. E. Eyton, Esq., M.P. for the Flint boroughs, proposed a vote of thanks to Miss Becker. He said he had always sympathised with the object she had in view, and he would promise to support the measure the next time it was brought before Parliament. (Applause.) A vote of thanks to the chairman concluded the proceedings. The *Rhyl Journal* had a good report.

PENSARN.

On July 20th, an address was delivered by Miss Becker, in the Assembly Room, Pensarn. The chair was occupied by John Rhys, Esq., H.M. Inspector of Schools. The chairman in opening the proceedings said that there was philological evidence to show that in the original stock from which the Indo-European races were descended, the social fabric was based on kinship founded on marriage, and that while the man was master, the woman was mistress of the household. This original condition of freedom seemed in later days to have degenerated into a condition of things, in which the husband and father exercised despotic power over the family, a condition from which society is again emerging. After Miss Becker's address, the usual vote of thanks was passed and the meeting separated.

BETTWS-Y-COED.

An address was delivered on July 21st, by Miss Becker, in the National School Room, Bettws-y-Coed, by the kind permission of the Rev. J. W. Griffith, vicar, who occupied the chair. In introducing the lecturer, the chairman expressed his entire sympathy with the object advanced. The room was small, but well filled with a select and fashionable audience, and the lecturer was received with attention and favour. Votes of thanks concluded the proceedings.

[The following reports have been unavoidably postponed.]

SKEGBY.

A meeting was held on February 15th, in the Free Methodist Chapel, Skegby, Notts. Mr. Willis Waid, of Mansfield, occupied the chair, and a petition was adopted in favour of the Bill.

BEDLINGTON.

A meeting was held on February 5th, in the Co-operative Hall, Bedlington, near Morpeth, Mr. James Davidson in the chair, when a petition was adopted in favour of Mr. Forsyth's Bill.

SHANKHOUSE.

On February 25th a meeting was held in the Colliery School Room, Shankhouse, Northumberland. Mr. William Dawson, miner, in the chair. A petition was adopted in favour of the Bill.

WATH.

A meeting was held on March 5th in the Reformers' Chapel, Wath, Yorkshire, Mrs. Lucy Ann Sidebottom in the chair, when a petition expressing the opinion that the present exclusion of duly qualified women from the power of voting in the election of members of Parliament is very injurious in many ways, was signed by the president of the meeting on behalf of the persons assembled, without a single exception.

SELBY.

A meeting was held in the Public Room, Selby, Yorkshire, on March 18th. Mr. John Foster, of Park House, in the chair. A petition to both Houses of Parliament was adopted and signed on behalf of the meeting.

Miss Craigen has also addressed meetings, on May 11th, in the Templar's Hall, WIGTON, Cumberland; on May 17th, in the Primitive Methodist Chapel, HALTON SEA GATE, Cumberland; and on May 26, in the Town Hall, HALTWHISTLE, Northumberland; and on May 27th, in the Primitive Methodist Chapel, WEST COANWOOD. Petitions were adopted at all these meetings. On June 2nd, Miss Craigen lectured in the Free Methodist Chapel, NEWBROUGH, near Hexham. The meeting was crowded to the doors and great interest shown, and the petition was carried unanimously. The chair was occupied by Mr. J. W. Hetherington, of Haydon Bridge, who said he had no idea previously of the legal position of women, or the abuses that existed, and he thought most people in Newbrough were in the same state of ignorance on the question till now; but after what they had heard, he thought that it was the duty of every woman to work in this cause, and of every man to help. There had been some doubts as to the propriety of holding these meetings in their chapels. But that was cleared now, in his mind at any rate, and he hoped that every Methodist chapel in the country would be at the service of the advocates of women's suffrage if they needed them, as he thought the cause was identified with religion and morality. There was much applause at this, and the meeting concluded with the usual votes of thanks.

SCOTLAND.

Miss Craigen has addressed meetings at GALASHIELS, in the Burgh Buildings, on March 20th, when there was a very full meeting, and an interesting discussion afterwards on the women's labour question; on March 25th, in the Mason's Lodge, MELROSE; on March 28th, in the Public Hall, MONTROSE; on April 8th, in the School-room, ARBROATH; on April 9th in the E. N. Church, STRATHAVEN, Lanarkshire; on April 11th, in the Volunteer Hall, SELKIRK; on April 20th, in the Town Hall, DALBEATTIE, near Dumfries; on April 23rd, in the Free Church School, LANGHOLM; and on April 27th, in the Hall, AUCHENCAIRN, Kirkcudbright. Petitions were adopted at these meetings. On May 12th Miss Craigen held a large open-air meeting at STENHOUSEMUR CROSS, near Stirling; the attendance was from 300 to 400, mostly iron-workers and colliers; petitions adopted. May 18th, she addressed a very large meeting in the Parish School, MAYBOLE, Ayr, Mr. Rivers in the chair; petitions carried by acclamation. On May 19th a well attended meeting at CROSSHILL Parish School, the Rev. James Crawford, Established Church minister, was in the chair; the attendance was mostly of farmers from the country round; the petition was carried. On May 26th, a very well attended meeting in the Good Templars' Hall, STEWARTON; the petition was carried with much warmth of feeling. On the 27th, a meeting in the School-room, MINISHANT; very full attendance. Minishant is hardly a village; there are perhaps 20 houses, for the rest it is a scattered district, inhabited by large farmers, and they came to the meeting in great force; the room was quite full. Mr. Clark, the teacher of the school, was in the chair. Besides the petitions adopted at these meetings, separate petitions of the inhabitants have been forwarded from several places.

The University of Leipzig has conferred on a young Jewish lady, Fraulein Rosa Rubinstein, the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Some two years back she gave a course of popular lectures on science.

PARLIAMENTARY INTELLIGENCE.

HOUSE OF LORDS, Friday, June 25.

OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON BILL.

In the absence of Lord HAMPTON, Lord STANLEY OF ALDERLEY moved the third reading of the Offences against the Person Bill, and said that great disappointment had been felt at the striking out of Clause 4 of the Bill, extending protection to the age of 13, and at the inconsistency with which the Bill, as it now stood, treated children under 13 as adult women, able to take care of themselves, while the Education Act treated them as children to be kept at school. The Bill was read a third time.

Monday, July 19.

Lord STANLEY OF ALDERLEY, in rising to ask whether the Government would amend the Education Act of 1870 by substituting the words "boys and unmarried women" for "children," said their lordships were aware that the police of Manchester had, at the bidding of the Manchester School Board, been making raids upon all the children of school age that they could find in the streets, in order to bring them into the Board Schools and compel their attendance. Now, by the Common Law of England as laid down by Lord Coleridge, it was lawful for a woman of 12 years of age to marry. Under these circumstances the following case might any day present itself:—A Manchester working man might select for himself a bride of 12 years of age, marry her, and take her to his home, when in consequence of her absence from school for a week or a fortnight, the police or School Board officials, on her first appearance in the public streets, might carry her off from her husband to hurry her away to the nearest Board School. (A laugh.) With or without a breach of the peace the case would then be brought before a magistrate for his decision, when the husband would plead his right to his wife's company at all times, under the Common Law, while the School Board official would show that the Education Act gave him the right, and imposed on him the duty, of enforcing her attendance at school for another year. How would the magistrates decide in such a case, and what view would the Home Secretary adopt? The Education Act of 1870 was a very sacred thing, which no Government was disposed to meddle with. Would the Government be disposed to ask Parliament to enact that no woman should marry till she had attained the age of 13 and had completed her schooling? The Education Department might be willing to allow a woman to marry when 12 years old, and be free from school, if she had completed a certain number of attendances during the previous year, but that might be open to the same objection which was raised to a clause in the Artisans' Dwellings Bill, that it would be resorting to the dispensing power. It was true that such cases might not be very frequent, but if they did occur they would lead to a conflict of law, and Her Majesty's Government could hardly say that they would not legislate for exceptions, when it was on the ground of these same exceptions that they rejected Clause 4 of the Offences against the Person Bill, which extended the protection of the law given to young girls up to the age of 13.

The Duke of RICHMOND said the Government had already so much business on their hands that he did not think it would be wise or convenient that they should at the present late period of the Session undertake to amend the Education Act of 1870 in the way suggested by the noble lord. He could, however, assure him that if he would himself introduce a Bill for the purpose it should receive the best attention of the Government, though he could not promise that they would give it a very cordial support.

CORRESPONDENCE.

WOMEN PARISHIONERS AND THE PUBLIC WORSHIP REGULATION ACT.

To the Editor of the Women's Suffrage Journal.

Madam,—I think one subject has hardly been noticed as it deserves, namely, the practical robbery of women's parochial rights by the Public Worship Regulation Act, which provides that every complainant must be a male parishioner. Now, why are women not allowed to be aggrieved parishioners? Women I know of have spent from £20,000 to £60,000 on the building of churches for that form of service which they believe to be most pleasing to the Almighty, whilst now their rights in respect of such buildings are placed below those of any discharged drunken bailiff, gardener, or coachman.

As the law now stands they must be silent under the grossest disregard of the Church's rules and services. At the same time they are still able to vote in vestry as ratepayers if they choose to claim the right. A friend of my own, an unmarried lady, was churchwarden of a parish in Glamorgan for many years; and I well remember an aged woman in Monmouthshire, whose mother was parish clerk, being the only person who could read. Now under the new Act we are not even allowed to complain. Is not this a retrograde measure?—Yours faithfully,

ELIZABETH HARCOURT MITCHELL.

Llanfrechfa Grange, Carleon,
July 1st, 1875.

To the Editor of the Women's Suffrage Journal.

Madam,—I beg to draw your attention, and those of your readers, to the special manner in which women have been excluded from the status of a parishioner in the new Act which has just come into force. As women in many country parishes are the principal landowners and supporters of the Established Church, often the only persons able or willing to assist in the services, or parochial work generally, I think it most strange and insulting to them as a body, that they should be so completely set aside and ignored in the working of an Act which is certainly as interesting and important to them as it can possibly be to men. I much fear we owe this exclusion to the jealous fear of undue clerical influence felt by many men, and wish I could believe there were no grounds for that feeling. Let women cultivate more freedom of thought and exercise their Protestant rights of private judgment more habitually, they will then be better able to hold and maintain their rightful position in the world whether of politics or religion, and claim those privileges of free-born subjects which are now so unjustly withheld from them.

INCOGNITA.

HOW PETITIONS ARE GOT UP.

The following narrative of the experience of a lady in a village in Cornwall throws a light on this subject. We commend it for the consideration of Mr. Leatham and his friends:—
“We have now obtained more than 400 signatures. The working men and women about here are very intelligent on the subject, and some so interested in it, on account of cases of suffering from iniquitous laws that have come under their personal notice, that they wish they might sign twice over. And they say they wish the Bill to pass as much, and more, for the sake of ‘the women up the country’ as for their own

sakes. For it seems to me that Cornish men are, as a rule, just towards women: certainly those who have been asked to sign seem as desirous for women's suffrage as the women themselves. Our signatures, even where only ‘his’ or ‘her mark,’ are those of intelligent men and women. We had quite an interesting little meeting on the subject yesterday. My right-hand in the matter is a very zealous poor woman, who walks her boots off her feet trotting about in the intervals of her other duties to get signatures, well fortified with simple arguments and papers.”

REVIEWS.

The Rights of Women.—A comparison of the relative legal status of the sexes in the chief countries of western civilization. Trübner and Co., 1875.

A clear and concise statement, such as this little book presents, of the most important laws affecting women in the principal civilized countries in the world, can hardly fail to prove both interesting and valuable to those who wish to acquaint themselves with the bearings of English law on English women. The comparisons here set forth show in the first place, that those states which have recently amended and revised their codes of law, have all advanced more or less towards an equality of law for men and women; have travelled further away from the old notion, common to all societies at a certain early stage of civilization, that women must be always under protection and tutelage, always in the “mund,” as our Saxon forefathers termed it, of some man. But in the next place, we perceive that in England, where legislation advances by a gradual process of modification, more consonant to our representative institutions, the tendency towards equal legislation between the sexes is in many points much behind the continental codes.

For example, in Austria, husband and wife have no mutual claim on each other's property, unless so stipulated at the time of marriage, and on the death of either, the survivor has an equal claim to the property of the other—very unlike our law, where the husband often can claim all the wife's property, and can leave all his away from her, if he so please. In Italy also, husband and wife each have the same claim on the property of the survivor, and all that a wife acquires in Italy after marriage becomes her “paraphernalia,” that is to say—using the word in a different sense from ours—becomes absolutely her own. It is in harmony with this complete ownership of her property that an Italian or Austrian wife is free to contract. In France, freedom of contract only applies if the wife is a trader, while in Denmark, very curiously, the advance has taken a different turn from what it has done in other countries, where the unmarried woman is more independent than the married. In Denmark, a woman cannot contract until she is married; “it is a remarkable difference between Danish law and our own, that with them, marriage removes disabilities instead of creating them.”

Again, how great an advantage French mothers enjoy in that the law insists on the surviving parent being guardian: and although the father may appoint an adviser by will, whom the mother is bound to consult, he cannot deprive her of the guardianship of her children.

The author of this book has done good service to the suffrage question by showing thus clearly that in that country where representation is recognised as the truest method of obtaining any improvement, the laws especially regarding women have on the whole improved most slowly, and we would commend the book more especially to the attention of those who deny that women need the suffrage, and who would probably be less

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN THE BOSTON FOURTH OF JULY ORATION.

It is ninety-nine years since the Declaration of Independence was made. In all these years no “orator of the day,” except at woman suffrage meetings, has made even an allusion to the fact that the women are disfranchised. But, on the Fourth of July just passed, the beginning of the end seemed to have come. James Freeman Clarke, invited by the City Government of Boston to deliver the oration, gave expression to such sentiments as these:—

“By means of universal suffrage we no doubt introduce a great deal of ignorance into the government. But at the same time we cause all to feel a personal interest in the government, and we accomplish the great object of widening the basis of representation, so as to neutralise the influence of local interests, caste, prejudices, and private aims. In the same fact, we find a basis for woman suffrage. Not because woman is the same in character, ability, and quality as man—but because she is different, we need her influence in public life. She will bring in new elements, and help still further in keeping legislation free from special tendencies. She may see many things which man does not, as he sees many things which she does not. She will make many mistakes, as he makes many mistakes,—but hers will be different from his and his from hers, and so they will neutralize each other. Providentially, we have prepared for this coming change by freely admitting girls with boys to all our schools, and we are now admitting the principle of co-education in many of our colleges. Life attains its true and best equilibrium not by monotony, but by the union of antagonistic elements, by differentiation and co-operation. For a perfect civilization men and women must be companions in everything, in work and play, in study, in all occupations, in art and literature, in science and discovery.”—*Woman's Journal* (Boston).

THE INFLUENCE OF WOMEN AT THE BALLOT BOX.—We don't believe there is a calm thinking man in Wyoming who does feel that woman's presence at the ballot box has worked for us, in the matter of elections alone, the greatest reform of the age. Our elections used to be a general public row and riot, which would put to shame a Donnybrook fair. Now they are as quiet, orderly, and peaceable as any other assemblage, no matter how heated and excited may be the campaign.—*Laramie Sentinel*.

PETITIONS.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.
PUBLIC PETITIONS.—FIFTEENTH TO TWENTY.
NINTH REPORT. 14th April to 14th July, 1875.

I. Parliament.

WOMEN'S DISABILITIES REMOVAL BILL.—*In Favour.*

Brought forward, Petitions 1,224—Signatures 405,530	
6439. April 7. ¶	Inhabitants of WISBEACH (<i>Mr. Rodwell</i>)... 30
*6440. — — ¶	OLDHAM (<i>Mr. Serjeant Spinks</i>) ... 639
6440. April 14. — ¶	MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Birley</i>) ... 321
*6441. — — ¶	(<i>Mr. Birley</i>) ... 496
*6442. — — ¶	All Saints Ward, MANCHESTER (<i>Mr. Birley</i>) ... 259
6443. — —	TAUNTON (<i>Sir Henry James</i>)... 19
*6444. — —	BALLYBAX, in the county of Monaghan (<i>Mr. Leslie</i>) ... 20
*6445. — —	SALISBURY (<i>Dr. Lush</i>)... 52
*6446. — —	LLANGOLLEN (<i>Mr. Osborne Morgan</i>)... 222
*6447. — —	GRAVESEND (<i>Captain Pim</i>) ... 442

ready to deny that need if they realised the greater equality existing on points of so much importance in neighbouring countries.

Possibly enough if the British nation were about to frame a revised code, as has just been done in Italy, that code might, like the Italian, discard many old relics of feudalism and barbarism; but taking things as they actually exist, comparisons such as this little volume helps us to make, strengthen the conviction both that there is room for advance in the laws relating to women in Great Britain, and also that that advance will be best sought in the manner most in accordance with the customs and the constitution of the country, that is to say, through the exercise of the suffrage.

MEDICAL EDUCATION OF WOMEN.

The Medical Council, composed of representatives from the nineteen licensing bodies, unions or Medical Corporations of the United Kingdom, has had occasion to discuss the admission of women to the profession. A letter was written by direction of the Lord President of the Privy Council requesting the Medical Council to express a general opinion on this subject. After three days' discussion on the answer, a vote was taken on the words “the Council are not prepared to say that women ought to be excluded from the profession,” and by a majority of fourteen to seven it was decided that these words should form part of the answer to the Government. The concession does not seem a great one, but those best informed say that it marks a new era in the struggle so long and gallantly carried on by and for the medical ladies.

The only Swiss lady in medical practice writes thus from Zurich to a former fellow-student now practising in London:

“I have been very successful in my practice. From the day I gave out that I was ready to begin, I have had no lack of patients. My practice extends to all ranks, and is almost limited to the diseases of women. I have had no difficulties to contend with; the prejudice against women will soon have been entirely overcome here. I have rather more than my proper share of work, and my finances are in a flourishing condition; at the end of my first quarter of medical practice I found that I had cleared my expenses. . . . Women are getting on well at the University. There are now fifteen lady medical students. Several of them are preparing for their final examinations, and are highly respected for their attainments and character. . . . It is delightful to learn how well our fellow-students are getting on; but the late terrible catastrophe (the loss of the Schiller) throws a shadow over the memory of those days when we all, who are now filling separate and independent spheres of usefulness, were working here together.”

The writer of the above, Dr. Marie Heim-Vögtlin, (now the wife of the Professor of Geology at the Zurich Polytechnic) began her studies at the University of Zurich in 1868, contemporaneously with the late lamented Dr. Susan Dimock. It may be interesting to mention that at the very time Dr. Vögtlin commenced to practice at Zurich, a Zurich lady staying in London on a short visit, gave it out as her opinion that women doctors were excellent for England and the English people; but that they would never make a living in Switzerland.

Miss Hannah de Rothschild has presented to the National Lifeboat Institution £2,000, to form and endow a lifeboat station, in memory of her father, Baron Mayer de Rothschild.

6448.	April 15.	Provost, Magistrates, and Town Council of CUPAR (<i>Mr. Ellice</i>) ...	Seal 1
*6449.	—	Inhabitants of DORCHESTER (<i>Mr. Floyer</i>) ...	102
*6450.	—	FROME (<i>Mr. Lopes</i>) ...	54
*6451.	—	BOWILSTON (<i>Mr. Christopher Talbot</i>)...	48
*6452.	—	Members of the Congregation of Libanus Chapel DOWLAIS (<i>Mr. Chris. Talbot</i>) ...	77
*6453.	April 16.	¶ Inhabitants of SHAPTESBURY, in the county of Dorset (<i>Mr. Bennett-Stanford</i>) ...	39
§6454.	April 16.	Inhabitants of CUPAR FIFE (<i>Mr. Ellice</i>)...	450
6455.	—	ANSTRUTHER EASTER (<i>Mr. Ellice</i>) ...	72
*6456.	—	British Subjects in CANNES (<i>Mr. Herbert</i>) ...	11
§6846.	April 19.	Members of the Jedforest Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, JEDBURGH; R. S. Edmonston, worthy chief templar (<i>Sir Henry Ferguson Davie</i>) ...	1
*6847.	—	Inhabitants of BRIDGENORIH (<i>Mr. Foster</i>) ...	109
§*6848.	—	RIPON, in public meeting assembled; William Thompson, mayor, chairman (<i>Earl de Grey</i>)... ..	1
*6849.	—	RIPON (<i>Earl de Grey</i>)... ..	768
*6850.	April 20.	¶ LYMINGTON (<i>Colonel Kennard</i>) ...	16
*6851.	—	¶ CAMBERWELL	41
*6852.	—	LYMINGTON	4
7138.	April 21.	Inhabitants of AYLESBURY (<i>Mr. Samuel Smith</i>)	36
7139.	April 22.	TUNBRIDGE WELLS (<i>Vis. Holmesdale</i>) ...	237
7902.	April 26.	Inhabitants of ARMAGH (<i>Mr. Close</i>) ...	81
8473.	April 29.	Inhabitants of ENNISKILLEN (<i>Mr. Archdale</i>) ...	39
8474.	—	¶ DEVONPORT (<i>Captain Price</i>)... ..	202
8475.	April 30.	DUNDONALD (<i>Lord A. Hill-Trevor</i>) ...	50
8834.	May 3.	¶ Inhabitants of HIGH WYCOMBE (<i>Colonel Carrington</i>)	640
8835.	May 4.	¶ EVESHAM, in the county of WORCESTER (<i>Colonel Bourne</i>)	79
8836.	—	¶ NEWRY (<i>Mr. William Whitworth</i>) ...	23
8837.	—	¶ Women Householdors, ROSTREVOR ...	3
9290.	May 5.	¶ Inhabitants of DOWNPATRICK (<i>Mr. Mulholland</i>)	41
9291.	May 7.	¶ WAREHAM (<i>Mr. Drax</i>)	153
§9292.	May 10.	— KEIGHLEY, in meeting assembled; John Clough, chairman (<i>Lord Fred. Cavendish</i>)	1
9293.	—	WELLINBOROUGH (<i>Mr. Ward Hunt</i>) ...	70
*9294.	May 21.	¶ DUDLEY (<i>Mr. Sheridan</i>)	2,299
11593.	May 31.	Inhabitants of HERTFORD (<i>Mr. Balfour</i>)...	829
11593*.	—	HERTFORD (<i>Mr. Balfour</i>)	43
11594.	June 2.	¶ OLDHAM (<i>Mr. Cobbett</i>)	810
11595.	—	Members of the Congregation of the Congregational Church, LLANFAIRFECHEAN (<i>Mr. Puleston</i>)	9
11596.	—	¶ Inhabitants of CONWAY, in the county of Carnarvon (<i>Mr. Puleston</i>)	40
16828.	June 22.	¶ LONDON (<i>Mr. Goschen</i>)	91
18705.	June 24.	¶ COMBE DOWN (<i>Mr. R. Bright</i>)... ..	21
§19670.	July 13.	— SAINT PANCRAS, in public meeting assembled; (<i>Name illegible</i>) chairman (<i>Sir Thomas Chambers</i>) ...	1

Total number of Petitions 1,273—Signatures 415,622

The petitions marked thus * are substantially similar to that from Southwark [APP. 3].
 The petitions marked thus † are similar to that from Northampton [APP. 4].
 The petitions marked thus § are similar to that from Inverness [APP. 5].
 The petitions marked thus ¶ have the addresses of some or all of the petitioners affixed.
 The petitions marked thus § are signed officially.

[The Appendix containing the text of the Petitions will be found on the second page of advertisements facing the leading article.]

MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS RECEIVED DURING JULY, 1875.

	£	s.	d.
Lady Anna Gore Langton (Lecture Fund)	25	0	0
Miss Edith Brooke (Second Donation)	8	0	0
Miss Harriette Rigbye (" ")	5	0	0
Mr. Philip Goldschmidt... ..	5	0	0
Mrs. Todd (Chester)	5	0	0
Miss E. A. Todd (")	5	0	0
Miss L. Todd (")	5	0	0
Mr. Henry Lightbown	3	3	0
Mr. J. J. Harwood (3 years)... ..	3	0	0
Mr. William Mather	2	2	0
The Dowager Lady Lytton	2	0	0
Mrs. Hetherington	1	3	6
Mr. W. Lawson	1	1	6
Mr. J. Barlow	1	1	0
Mr. J. B. M'Kerrow	1	1	0
Miss Mabel Sharman Crawford	1	0	0
Mrs. N. Pearce Sharman	1	0	0
Mr. T. Winston	1	0	0
Mr. Mark Price... ..	1	0	0
Mr. H. Nicol (Second Donation)... ..	0	10	6
Mrs. Sawyer	0	10	6
Mr. Thos. Peel... ..	0	10	6
Mr. James Burnett... ..	0	10	0
J. R. (Second Donation)... ..	0	10	0
Hon. Mrs. Thos. Liddell	0	10	0
Mr. Thos. Falconer... ..	0	10	0
Mr. Geo. Senior	0	7	6
Miss R. Allen Olney	0	6	0
Mr. M. Ridgway	0	5	0
Mr. A. Porter	0	5	0
Mr. James Grundy	0	5	0
Mr. J. A. Lyon	0	5	0
Miss Thomas (London)	0	5	0
Miss M. A. Brown (Wigan)	0	5	0
Misses Cogan	0	3	0
Misses Bond	0	3	0
Mr. P. Gendall... ..	0	2	6
Mrs. Dawson	0	2	6
Mr. John Thompson	0	2	6
J. B.	0	2	6
Miss M. A. Evans (Alderley Edge)	0	2	6
Miss C. A. Biggs	0	2	6
Miss Crook (Southport)	0	2	6
Miss M. A. Handson	0	2	6
Miss Dunkin	0	2	6
Mrs. Porter (Birkenhead)	0	2	6
Mr. C. Whitmell	0	2	0
Miss E. B. Pridcaux	0	2	0
Mrs. Green... ..	0	2	0
Mrs. Helen A. Withall	0	1	6
Miss Agnes Wells	0	1	0
Mrs. Markby	0	1	0
Mrs. Hickson	0	1	0
Miss Babb	0	1	0
Captain and Mrs. Bufham	0	1	0
Miss Wade	0	1	0
Mrs. Pidgeon	0	1	0
Miss Martin	0	1	0
Miss A. F. Parsons	0	1	0
Miss Emma Phillips... ..	0	1	0
Mrs. Slatter	0	1	0
A Subscriber	0	1	0
Anonymous	0	1	0
Collected by Mrs. Addison	0	12	0
" Mrs. Chandler	0	10	0
" Mrs. Poole	1	10	0

£87 10 0

S. ALFRED STEINTHAL.

Cheques and Post Office Orders should be made payable to the Treasurer, Rev. S. ALFRED STEINTHAL, and may be sent either direct to him at 81, Nelson-street; or to the Secretary, Miss BECKER, 28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester.

SUMMARY OF PETITIONS UP TO JULY 14th, 1875.

	No. of Petitions signed Officially	Total No. of Petitions.	Total No. of Signatures.
Women's Disabilities Bill—In favour	78	1,273	415,622