

# WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

VOL. V.—NO. 55. PUBLISHED MONTHLY.  
REGISTERED FOR TRANSMISSION ABROAD.

SEPTEMBER 1, 1874.

PRICE 1d.—BY POST 1½d.

THE first session of the new Parliament has passed away without any opportunity being afforded of pronouncing a verdict on the claim of women citizens to the exercise of the Parliamentary franchise. The first division in any Parliament is always a most important one, and is rightly held to be significant as to progress with regard to the past, and prospects for the future. It therefore behoves all friends of the cause to use every effort during the recess to influence the minds of their representatives in favour of our principle. They may find occasions for such efforts when members make their usual visits to their constituencies, and we trust that the chronicle of extra-Parliamentary utterances during the next few weeks may contain many indications that honourable members are giving to this question their most earnest and serious consideration.

We are glad to be able to state that the expectation expressed in our last issue, that when the time came for determining the form of the Bill for the ensuing session, Mr. FORSYTH and his Parliamentary coadjutors would decide to adopt the original draft of the measure, has been fulfilled. Mr. FORSYTH has definitely announced his determination, in introducing the Bill next session, to omit the proviso. The question to be submitted to the new Parliament will therefore be the same in terms as that which was before its predecessor. The proposal will be simply the removal of the disability of *sex* in Parliamentary elections.

The reform which we are now seeking with regard to the Parliamentary vote was accomplished in respect of the municipal suffrage in 1869. It may help to elucidate our present position if we briefly recapitulate the circumstances under which that victory was won, and the nature of the measure which was carried. In the first session of the Parliament elected in the autumn of 1868, being the first House of Commons chosen by the newly-enfranchised electors, a Bill was brought forward by Mr. HIBBERT to amend the Municipal Franchise Acts of 1835, by assimilating the conditions under which householders in boroughs enjoyed the municipal vote to those under which they exercised the Parliamentary Franchise. During the

passing of this Bill through the House of Commons, Mr. JACOB BRIGHT moved the insertion of the following clause, which extended the Municipal Franchise to women householders: "In this Act and the said recited Act of the fifth and sixth years of King WILLIAM the FOURTH, chapter seventy-six, and the Acts amending the same, wherever words occur which import the masculine gender, the same shall be held to include females for all purposes connected with and having reference to the right to vote in the election of councillors, auditors, and assessors." Mr. HIBBERT, the mover of the Bill, supported the proposal, and the present Lord ABERDARE, who was then Home Secretary, speaking on behalf of the Government, said that "the honourable member had shown conclusively that this proposition was no novelty, and that in every form of local government, except under the Municipal Corporation Act, women were allowed to vote. The clause introduced no novelty, and he should give it his cordial support." The clause was adopted without a dissentient voice, or the faintest shadow of opposition.

In the House of Lords an attempt was made to reject the clause, but the proposal found no seconder, and therefore fell to the ground. The attempt was, however, of service, as it proved that the clause was not passed unadvisedly. The Lords, after their attention had been especially called to the matter, deliberately affirmed the principle of giving women householders votes in local government, and of admitting them every year to the polling booths on the same conditions as men. The Earl of KIMBERLEY supported the proposition on behalf of Mr. GLADSTONE'S Government, and the present LORD-CHANCELLOR, then the leader of the Opposition in the House of Lords, also spoke in favour of it. Lord CAIRNS said "as an unmarried woman could dispose of her property, and deal with it in any way she thought proper, he did not know why she should not have a voice in saying how it should be lighted and watched, and generally in controlling the municipal expenditure to which that property contributed." We had thus the spectacle which we hope to see repeated at no very distant date, of the responsible leaders of both political parties

concurring in a measure for the enfranchisement of women householders. We hold that the words of Lord CAIRNS are applicable to the property and the electoral rights of women citizens in imperial as well as in local government and expenditure, and we may reasonably hope that when the time shall come for their decision that he and those who agreed with him on the former occasion will proceed farther in the same direction, and carry out those views to their legitimate conclusion with respect to the Parliamentary franchise for women.

WE receive through the Swiss papers the important intelligence that the General Assembly of the Canton of Schwytz has resolved upon granting the political vote to all women with independent property; adding their admissibility to State employments. This was effected with the concurrence of both political parties, Liberal and Ultramontane. We trust that this good example may speedily be followed in the other cantons.

#### ARE WOMEN READY TO BEAR ARMS?

THE *Broad Arrow* (military and naval organ) summarily and somewhat bluntly assumes to settle the "Women's Rights" question from an army point of view. In reviewing Professor GOLDWIN SMITH'S paper, our contemporary, as is perhaps natural under the circumstances, takes it for granted that the foundation for the legal capacity to exercise electoral rights is personal liability for military service. He says:—

"The point in his (Professor Goldwin Smith) paper that most interests us is one that seems to have been strangely overlooked in the controversy, and is the key to the whole position. Whatever inequalities women have had to bear we have protected them from the direct evils of war. They have not borne arms, and they have not been asked to do so. They are now—at least, the more self-asserting of them—asking for the full privileges of citizenship. Are they willing to serve the commonwealth as soldiers? If they must have a vote, are they willing also to shoulder a gun? If not, their whole position is weak and untenable, and they must relinquish it.

"It is well to have found a question for women-agitators that has the force of a broadside, or an 80-ton gun. They bear no armour that can resist. Ridicule they have borne, with 'nods, and becks, and wreathed smiles,' but there is so much vital force in the question that heads our article that it must end in the complete overthrow of the whole army of agitators. A citizen, unable to bear arms in defence of the State, and yet of ripe and proper age, is an anomaly that cannot be tolerated. The State has the right to the military service of all its citizens. Its very existence depends upon this right in the last resort, and if it were threatened those persons would be poltroons who resisted the right. Should we ever have the right to demand that women shall bear arms? Undoubtedly we should have it the moment they claimed and secured full political equality with men. It is in their argument, if they would but see it,

but see it they certainly do not. They are fond of using the term 'subjection.' Would they be less in subjection if they had the power to vote, the right to sit in parliament, and yet were weak enough to leave the men to do all the fighting? They would either be protected by the men or not protected at all.

"Granted, however, that women had full political power, and all they desire in their hearts, would not the aversion to military life, the relegation of all the fighting to men, create a new disability, on the side of the males? The women might vote a war, and the men would have to fight it, whereas when the men vote a war they do not ask the other sex to undertake it for them.

"Nor is it sufficient to answer that women are more pacific than men, and that if we gave women votes we should have the millennium. Mr. Smith is very pointed here, and says:—'Female sovereigns, as a rule, have not been eminently pacific. It would be difficult to find four contemporary male rulers who made more wars than Catherine II. of Russia, Maria Theresa, Madame de Pompadour, (who ruled France in the name of her lover), and the Termagant, as Carlyle calls her, of Spain. It is widely believed that the late Empress of the French, inspired by her Jesuits, was a principal mover in the attack on Germany. Those who know the Southern States say that the women there are far more ready to renew the civil war than the men. The most effective check on war is, to use the American phrase, that everyone should do his own fighting.'

"There is another and a not less powerful part of the argument. Legal force is but a fiction. There is no force in law, that is, for the unruly, unless it be backed by physical force. Military power lies behind every other kind of State force, and must be had recourse to in the last resort. Are women ready to make laws, and to take no share in the equally high and noble duty of enforcing them? Unless they are ready to wield the policeman's truncheon, and carry the soldier's gun and bayonet, they will always, as a class, be incomplete citizens, relying upon the other sex for aid, or using them as if they were mercenaries. The answer to all agitations may best be given in this form. Admit everything, and then put the test question, Are you ready to bear arms? We are quite convinced that in proportion as the present agitations are met by this simple question will they die out, and their absurdity be revealed."

The above article was inserted in the *Herald of Peace*, and in the succeeding month's issue a reply appeared in the form of a letter to the Editor, from "A mother of sons and daughters," from which we extract the following:—

"Will it not be a sufficient answer to say that, although women do not 'bear arms,' they do 'bear' children, and that in so doing they not unfrequently meet death, and that in the flower of their age. It would probably assist in answering the question, if there were a correct return to be had of the number of women who annually perish in this struggle. Do not women contribute their share, by bringing into the world the 'raw material' of soldiers, so to speak? To have to fight as well is surely an unreasonable demand? Again, women are not the only class exempt from bearing arms. All the clergy and ministers of religion share this freedom, and they are not deprived in consequence of the right to assist in our representative Government.

"This gallant warrior does not stick at anything in the way of argument, for he at the same time gives women credit for so peaceable a disposition that they have an aversion to a military life; and yet with so great a fondness for war, that they

would actually *vote a war*, and endeavour to *force* the men to fight. Surely the force of *un-reason* can no further go!

"Do women, then, generally show so great delight when war is proclaimed, and their nearest and dearest are called on to face its dangers? No; this is not the fact. *Women do not love war.* A few unprincipled, ambitious, or unfortunate sovereigns do not represent the sex. Women, as a whole, will be found to be on the side of *peace*, and, where encouraged to express their opinion, will help in bringing on the reign of peace.

"Can Mr. Goldwin Smith point out any instance during any of the destructive and bloody wars of this century, in which women have *collectively* fanned the dreadful flame? Have they not rather distinguished themselves by their anxiety to soften its horrors and bring comfort to its victims? See Florence Nightingale and the nurses who accompanied her in the Sanitary Commission of Ladies during the American war, and the devoted services rendered during the Franco-German war, by compassionate women! Mr. Smith's last argument is that 'Legal force is but a fiction.' That takes us back indeed to barbarous times. We had hoped that something stronger yet than physical force swayed mankind, *if not*, we are not much the better yet of our boasted Christianity.

A second letter, from some ladies at Edinburgh, remarks:—

"We ask if the *Broad Arrow* means that all persons who are unable from any cause to bear arms, are thereby unfitted to exercise the citizen right of the franchise. Are all the ministers of religion—all the Society of Friends—all who are over age—all who have any physical infirmities which disqualifies for army service, unfitted to give a vote in the election of a member of parliament? 'The key to the whole position' of the article is that 'a citizen unable to bear arms in defence of the State is an anomaly that cannot be tolerated.' 'The State has the right to the military service of all its citizens. *Its very existence depends* on this right.' Now we would point to a far higher power for the protection of the State than the puny arms of the strongest man can afford; to recall the fact that states have tottered and nations have suffered dreadfully, notwithstanding the existence of immense armies, nay even *because* of their existence.

"The writer of the article seems terribly afraid that if women have the vote they will vote the country into a war, and leave men to fight it, if they themselves are exempted from military service. Even supposing, but not admitting, for a moment that this might be the case, the position of affairs would not be very different from what it is at present; except that now it is men who vote the country into war, and to send other men to fight it, and leave women to help to pay for it and to suffer in it, from the highest to the lowest in the land—to suffer, if not always in their own persons, yet far more intensely through the persons of those who are dearer to them than their own lives.

"We are referred to the 'kindly humanities of the past' which would be disturbed by giving votes to women, and we have the chivalrous assertion that '*Women must either be protected by the men, or not protected at all.*' As far as we can remember, the kindly humanities of the 'past,' in respect to the warrior's share, have certainly too often been found to belong to that class of 'tender mercies' which have been pronounced to be unmistakably '*cruel*,' and we shudder to think of the kind of protection that war has often afforded to women."

The above replies to the position assumed by the *Broad Arrow*, that the test question to be applied to persons seeking enfranchisement is the simple one—"Are you

ready to bear arms?" appear to us conclusive. But they are by no means exhaustive, and we hope to recur to the subject on a future occasion.

WE ask our friends who are disposed to help in the work of the Petitions to lose no time in beginning to do it. We refer them to the announcement in our advertising columns for instructions how to proceed; and we would paraphrase for our own cause the exhortation recently given at Sheffield by Mr. Macdonald, M.P., in regard to the county franchise. With him we would say that we want men and women of the towns and counties to raise their voices during this recess, and lay upon the table of the House of Commons Petitions so numerous that Mr. DISRAELI, and every one connected with Her Majesty's present Government, would learn that men cried for the extension of the suffrage to women, and women themselves cried for the suffrage; and that we hope that the Petitions will be numerous enough to make the table of the House of Commons groan under their weight, and cry out to the House to give women householders equal rights with those of men.

#### THE MEMBERS FOR MARYLEBONE AND WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

On July 29th, in accordance with custom, Sir Thomas Chambers, Q.C., and Mr. Forsyth, Q.C., attended the St. Pancras Vestry. The Rev. Prebendary Thorold, the vicar, presided, and the meeting was very fully attended. Sir T. Chambers, Q.C., M.P., as the senior representative, first addressed the meeting. In the course of his speech, which touched on the principal questions of the day, he said: Then there was the Women's Disabilities Bill. That was a measure which he would leave his honourable colleague to deal with, as it belonged to him. He would only say that he supported it. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Forsyth, Q.C., M.P., after referring to his Parliamentary career, said, his colleague had said the Women's Disabilities Bill belonged to him, and he could only say that he had no stronger evidence in favour of its justice than the petition from St. Pancras Vestry, which pointed to the rectitude observed by females in the exercise of their franchise under municipal law, and their right to share in a voice in the representation for which they were taxed. (Hear, hear.) After some further observations the hon. gentleman resumed his seat amid applause.

#### MR. JACOB BRIGHT AT MIDDLETON.

The foundation stone of a new Liberal club was laid at Middleton, Lancashire, by Mr. Jacob Bright, on August 1st. At a public meeting held in the evening, Mr. Bright said, after referring to some remarks by a previous speaker on the admission of women to the suffrage, he wanted to see women householders in the same position as men householders. If Liberal principles meant anything he thought they meant that there should be no large class of persons living in this country under a despotic government. Women had many laws passed in regard to them which men would not tolerate, and which were despotic because in regard to them they had never been consulted. All he asked for was that they should be consulted in the constitutional way at the polling booth. (Cheers.)

## AN UNDELIVERED SPEECH IN THE WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE DEBATE.

We have been favoured with a copy of a speech which was to have been delivered in the House of Commons in the debate on Mr. Forsyth's Bill, on June 23rd last, by the honourable member for Weissnichtwo.

"I rise, sir, to oppose the motion for the second reading of this Bill. It would introduce an altogether new element into the politics of this country, the emotional element. It is an axiom that men are guided by pure reason, women by pure feeling. Men never allow the cool dictates of an impartial judgment to be swayed by passion or emotion of any kind. More especially in the exercise of the high function of choosing members of the Legislature is this masculine characteristic apparent. We never hear of masculine electors allowing their votes to be influenced by any other consideration than an intelligent comparison of the merits of the candidates, and a rational and logical review of the scope and tendency of the principles they respectively profess. But if you were to pass the Bill in question, this happy state of things would be disturbed. We should have electors who would be amenable to the influences of the tea-urn; nay, in time even the beer barrel might come to be one of the factors in the elements of a contested election. It would be in the highest degree dangerous to the best interests of the State to introduce into the electoral body a class of persons not gifted with strength of mind to resist temptations such as these. Then, again, we know how weak women are in other respects. They would be accessible by direct money bribes. A mysterious personage appearing on the scene of an election with a bag full of half-crowns would easily secure the suffrages of a majority of the women electors. There are, doubtless, exceptional women who would not be influenced by such purely sordid considerations. But we ought not to legislate for exceptions. More subtle agencies, too, would not be wanting. Kindness to children is a ready way to their parent's hearts. We should hear of candidates actually kissing the babies of their constituents, and we might find an honourable member declaring that he had caught the measles in the process. Charity, too, is a powerful recommendation to the womanly heart, although charity has nothing to do with politics. Therefore, in a constituency containing women electors, we might find a candidate contributing largely to the local charities in order to prove his fitness to represent the borough. Could anything be more illogical than such a proceeding? We might have an election petition for a certain borough, and we might find the honourable member against whose return the petition was made coming into the witness box and stating that since he had represented the borough he had paid £200 a year to the local charities, and we might find that such a payment was held to be not inconsistent with an appeal to the constituency on purely logical and political grounds. Then consider the amount of ignorance and unintelligent prejudice that exists among women. We might have an election at Pontefract in which one-sixth of the electors were so ignorant that they were unable to distinguish the printed names of the candidates one from another; and we might hear of an election petition at Stroud at which such a dialogue as the following might take place between the Judge and one of the newly-enfranchised electors:—"His Lordship: Do you know which party governs the country now?—Witness: The yellows, I suppose, sir. (Laughter.) His Lordship: Do you suppose Mr. Disraeli is a 'yellow'?—Witness: Well, I don't know, sir. (Laughter.) His Lordship: You don't know?—Witness: I don't know; I'm a [woman] as can't understand. His Lordship: When you gave your vote did you know what

principles you were voting for. Did you know what party the colour you voted for represented?—Witness: Yellow is the Liberal party. (Laughter.) His Lordship: What are the other party called?—Witness: The blues. (Loud laughter.) His Lordship: Don't you know any other name.—Witness: No, sir. His Lordship: What are the blues?—Witness: I don't know what they do call 'em. (Renewed laughter.) His Lordship: Have you heard of Mr. Disraeli's name?—No answer. His Lordship: Have you heard the name of the present Prime Minister?—Witness: No, sir. I don't know. (Laughter.) His Lordship: Mr. Gladstone. Have you heard of him?—Witness: Oh, yes; Mr. Gladstone. (Loud laughter.) His Lordship: What is he?—Witness: I suppose he is a Liberal, sir; I think. His Lordship: Do you know what opinions the Liberals have?—Witness: I think the Liberals be the best side of the party, sir. (Laughter.) Mr. Hawkins: This is one of the new voters under [Mr. Forsyth's] Act. His Lordship: Yes; and I was rather curious to see what [she] knew about it. But there are other considerations which should induce the House to reject this Bill. Has it considered the exceedingly dangerous and revolutionary character of the class it is proposed to enfranchise?—The institutions of the country would not be safe.—The old landmarks of society would be uprooted. The most cherished traditions of family and domestic life would be scouted and set at naught. The existence of marriage itself would be threatened. Marriage was instituted for the protection and security of the wife, for we all know that women lose their attractions in the eyes of men at an early age, and but for the compulsory permanence of the marriage tie they would be discarded by men as soon as they had passed their first youth, and turned out with their children to pass their remaining years in a dishonoured and deserted condition. Therefore it is obvious that as soon as women obtained political power they would use it to destroy the permanence of the marriage tie. Then let the House consider that the passions of women are much more violent than those of men. It frequently happens that men have to appeal to the law for protection against the personal violence of their wives. Only recently a woman was committed for trial in Salford for striking her husband with an iron bar. The House cannot have forgotten that at Chipping-Norton last year a number of women with babies in their arms intimidated a band of agricultural labourers to such an extent as to deter them from their work, and the women (with the babies) were sent to prison for the offence. Surely the sex capable of such manifestations of ungovernable and ferocious emotion is not fit to be trusted with the franchise. I beseech the House to pause before reading for the second time a Bill which would have a tendency to introduce into the present system of government by pure reason, and calm dispassionate logic, emotional elements such as these, and I shall therefore support the amendment of the hon. member for Mid-Lincoln."

## UNIVERSITY EXAMINATIONS FOR WOMEN.

Two of the lady students of Girton College, Cambridge, were examined in the papers set in the previous examination, held at this University, and both attained a standard which would have entitled them to have passed in the first class. One of these ladies wrote as follows, in reply to a friend who had congratulated her on her success:—"I am afraid I have no right to accept such flattering expressions as you kindly use, since the examination I have passed is beneath contempt. The predominant feeling aroused by it is astonishment how it is possible for men to fail in it after having spent all their school life in work on the subject. It is an inscrutable wonder."

## THE ADMISSION OF WOMEN TO THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.

The following letter was addressed a few weeks ago by Dr. Wilks, to the Editor of the "British Medical Journal."  
Sir,—Having found myself in a minority of the medical graduates by signing the memorial to the Senate of the University of London in favour of the admission of women to degrees, I have been placed in an apologetic position before my friends, who maintain that the measure was carried by enthusiastic and theoretic artsmen, whilst the experienced members of the medical faculty were uniformly opposed to it. I will not attempt to gainsay this, but give my reasons for supporting it by my name. I need not reiterate, nor even mention, the arguments constantly used by the women's rights advocates, but simply state why, as a medical man, I was favourable to this and like proposals; it is, in fact, because I regard the question from a professional point of view that I support the effort made for the higher education of women; and it is for this reason I venture to trouble you with my opinion.

I have been in the habit of looking at the matter in this way, referring only, as I said before, to reasons suggested by my calling. I see in England a superabundance of women, a very large excess over men—families with numerous unmarried daughters—and, therefore, it is certain that these cannot possibly (unless bigamy became legal) fulfil the first functions of the sex. I look upon these human beings as so many powerful and active machines developing large forces which must operate upon and influence everything surrounding them. If they do not work for good, they will for evil; or if restrained, work out their own destruction. The trite rhyme, of the devil finding something for idle hands to do, cannot be too often reiterated in the youthful ear, whether it be male or female; and it is equally true that, if action of all kinds be restrained, the bodily force operates as a canker-worm and devours its producer. Activity, however, which is fruitless is better than no action at all, and the woman who makes pleasure her occupation, and all the little affairs of the society in which she mixes the business of her life, and as "idly busy rolls her world away," preserves at least her health. But let her have no object placed before her to stimulate her to exertion, and she falls a prey to the operation of those powerful nerve-forces which are constantly being produced within her, and which ought to find their correlation in some outward active pursuit. My own experience is, that a large number of girls' ailments are due to idleness and the consequent *ennui*; and that the nerve-forces are as self-destructive as an unrestrained locomotive engine would be, which, if not properly directed, would injure everything with which it came into contact, or soon cripple itself. I have seen lamentable instances of girls amongst the middle classes whose bodily and moral health has been destroyed by wrong-headed parents, who, under a mistaken view of religion, have deprived them of every amusement except the chapel on Sunday and Exeter Hall during the month of May, at the same time enforcing upon them lessons of self-reflection. These poor creatures have become fretful, peevish, dyspeptic, and nervous, with all energy washed out of them, and at last die piously of consumption. If they have been fortunate enough to dwell in a village, they may have found work in the church or the school; but that their devotedness had no higher aim than occupation is borne witness to by many a clergyman, who finds how his church decorations fail when the young ladies get married.

My own experience is, that the strong, active, right-minded girls are those who have been well educated at school or college, and who are constantly engaged in work for themselves or

others; who are employed at drawing, sculpture, languages, or even science; whilst the sickly, complaining creatures, who are ever in the doctor's hands, are those who are doing nothing. One of the most and worst chronic cases of hysteria I have ever known was cured immediately upon the young lady being required to take charge of her father's house.

Seeing, then, all these evil consequences of want of occupation, and seeing the young women themselves asking for work and to be allowed to follow various pursuits for their livelihood, it seems to me hard and unjust to deprive them of the opportunity. In the lower classes, when the man dies, the wife keeps the shop, or even conducts a large business requiring considerable management. If she unfortunately belong to a class of society above this, she is prevented from supporting herself and family from want of legal qualification.

I have no intention of advocating the desirability of women entering the professions of medicine or the law, but it seems to me that, if they were allowed to do so, the numbers would be so small, that they would in no way alter the present aspect of society. At the same time, I would not limit all the privileges of endowed universities, colleges, and schools to one sex, but let the other participate in them. The argument in use at the present time against the physical disadvantages of overtraining of girls, and the sapping of their health, must, of course, receive due attention, in the same way as would the injurious training of boys or young men fitting themselves for any special sphere of life. At present, it has not been my lot to have learned from those connected with girls' colleges that any injurious effects to health have ensued; but I have frequently heard of the marked good which has followed full occupation and emulation. My own experience has been exactly of the same kind. In a word, the great argument against women's work is, that they are not fitted for it; their answer is, they are able and willing if no impediments be placed in their way. I for one would remove all restrictions, and let the field be open.—I am, etc.,

SAMUEL WILKS, M.D.

## IS THERE SEX IN INTELLECT?

But then it is said, there is sex in mind as well as in body, and therefore women's culture should follow a different path and aim at a different end from men's. That is all very pretty as a theory. But as the two most thoughtful speakers in the recent debate in the University of London, Mr. Fitch and Mr. Ostler, both showed, it is in the theoretical rather than in the practical stage of the question that such a statement takes the fancy. The University of London did its best to act on the theory. It drew up an examination for women intended to be a feminine equivalent for the matriculation examination for boys, with (originally) somewhat less of mathematical requirement, with a choice of Italian in the place of Greek, with a rather higher examination in English history and literature, and questions in physical geography not put to the young men, and with an alternative of Botany in the place of Chemistry. After all the difference was very slight, but what was most remarkable was this—that, slight as it was, it had to be constantly attenuated. The young ladies hardly ever chose the alternatives of Italian and Botany. They complained of the smallness of the requirements in mathematics, and asked and eventually obtained leave to take up as much mathematics as the lads, with a compensating remission of the examination in one of their own feminine subjects. And the net result was, as Mr. Ostler justly said, that the difference between the girls' examination and the boys' is now a difference not in reality, but in name. Again Mr. Fitch describes very ably his own

embarrassment as an Examiner in trying to discover what specially feminine aspect he could give to his questions in English history and literature. Try as he would, he could not manage it. Of course, girls might show greater taste for one class of subjects, and boys for another, but how was he to frame questions which would distinguish the feminine familiarity with English institutions and English poets from the masculine? After all knowledge is knowledge, and there is no more a specifically feminine way of describing correctly the origin of the Lollard movement, or the character of Spenser's poetry, than there is a specifically feminine way of solving a quadratic equation or proving the 47th proposition of Euclid's first book. Women and men may and will assimilate somewhat different elements in the teaching they receive; but knowledge, after all, is one, and neither men nor women can know the same truth adequately without knowing it in the same way.—*The Spectator*.

### REVIEWS.

The *Westminster Review* for July contains an able article on the Emancipation of Women, from which we extract the following passages:

"Before going further in this direction we will just notice the chief objections that have been raised to the emancipation of women, objections mostly of detail, raised by those who, unable to grasp a large general idea, instinctively fix their eyes successively on the supposed difficulties of carrying it out. Some of these objections—most of them, in fact—serve to display the curious ingenuity of the human mind in imagining hindrances to any alteration of the established order of things; the first feeling being always, not, how can we see our way to grant this, but, how shall we discover a sufficient number of objections to justify our refusal?"

"The objections in question have been answered over and over again, and it is a curious fact that in this discussion masculine opponents to the emancipation of women seemed to have changed their traditional parts with women. Women urge a principle—men stumble at the details. Or, do they acknowledge the principle, but decline to carry it to its legitimate results? Women ask for justice—men offer privileges; women advance reasons—men answer with their own feelings and instincts; women meet assertions with evidence in disproof—men re-assert them without attempting further proof.

"Here, however, is the first, perhaps the only objection which really deserves attention, that the majority of women do not desire the suffrage. We answer that the minority which does desire it is a constantly increasing one (not adequately represented even by the increasing number of signatures to petitions). We must further point out that a large portion of the majority which does not desire it, has simply not been educated to think about it, while the minority that does desire it includes very many women of the highest intellect and cultivation who have thought deeply on the subject, and many women of the highest excellence and cultivation who have thought deeply on the subject, and many who feeling for themselves and their neighbours the need of better protection than masculine legislation has hitherto allowed them, gladly welcome the faintest hope of emancipation. Next, as to those who can desire the suffrage without signing petitions for it, few men can realise without some effort of the imagination the pressure put upon women in all cases where their views differ from those of the masculine public. There is, to begin with, their own tenderness for the prejudices of those with whom they live, not to say positive prohibition by fathers and husbands, such arbitrary interference with the independence of mature minds being so

sanctioned by law and custom, that it is hard even for those who suffer from it to resist it. Next, we must take into account that intense shrinking from masculine sarcasm and mockery which has been so carefully fostered in women that they have justly been said to 'live under a gospel of ridicule.' And it is a part of our argument that this moral coercion has been lavishly employed to supplement the legal subjection of women, much of their boasted acquiescence in what we consider a faulty state of things having been thus produced. Few can realise, we repeat, without some reflection, some sympathetic insight, how much silent revolt goes on in subjected classes before they openly rebel. In men this silent revolt is generally held to be dangerous, and worth inquiring into, in women for obvious reasons it is not. And with women it will be longest maintained, and with more corroding bitterness in proportion, in spite of the persuasions, half flattering, half contemptuous, which now more frequently than before alternate with sneers."

### WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE IN ENGLAND AND AMERICA.

The following extract is from a paper contributed by an American writer to the August number of the *Victoria Magazine* :—

There is no suffrage whatever for American women, except the very recent attempts that have been made in Boston and Philadelphia to allow women to vote on school questions; while English women have Municipal and School Board votes, and directly control large numbers of Parliamentary votes. One day last autumn, as I was walking along the streets of London, I noticed an unusual number of what Londoners call sandwiches, viz., men walking between two large advertisements, which are suspended about the neck. On one of these boards in large letters I read, "Vote for Mrs. —!" On the other side I read, "Vote for Miss Chessar! Upon inquiry I found that these ladies were candidates for places on the School Board, which, by the way, is a great institution in London and the larger towns; we have nothing similar that can compare with it in importance. For several successive nights I went to hear these ladies electioneer for themselves, assisted by some of the first men and women in London. The meetings were crowded, and though very enthusiastic, everywhere the most perfect order and decorum prevailed. "This," I said, "in monarchical England. Why cannot women have such liberty in America?" A few days after I was passing a large church in a fashionable part of the city, and before the door I noticed a great number of fine carriages; I thought what a fine wedding there must be this morning. As I passed into the adjoining parish, I saw a similar crowd before the parish church, and meeting a friend I remarked "how many weddings there seem to be this morning." My friend informed me that the "weddings" were elections that were held in the school-rooms adjoining the churches, and invited me to go in and witness the many English women performing the remarkable phenomenon. I went, and actually saw ladies step from their carriages, pass in, and deposit their ballots, and pass out again, to all appearance the same as they went in, whereas I rather expected to see them as they left the polls transformed into some sort of monsters. I actually saw women voting, a thing I had never seen in America. The only woman who ever attempted it there was imprisoned! I am happy to say that the two ladies whose fortunes I thus followed from the "sandwiches" to the "polls" were both elected. In the full exercise of local suffrage, in the direct control of parliamentary votes, with women physicians, lecturers, stump speakers, and office-

holders, with princesses who appear on state occasions in full uniform on horseback at the head of their own regiments, with a queen at the head of the government, is not England in advance of America in giving to women a place and voice in the affairs of the nation?"

### CHINESE MANIFESTO ON INFANTICIDE.

The following quaint proclamation, issued by Chinese officials, condemning the prevailing practice of murdering female children, is quoted by a correspondent of the *Times* :—

"The Provincial Treasurer of Hupei has to issue a proclamation prohibiting, in the strongest terms, the drowning of female children. In ancient times the girl T'iyang begged his Majesty Wên to permit her to sacrifice her liberty in order that her father, who was in disgrace, might be released from bondage. In another case again, the girl Mulan wished to serve as a soldier in order to take upon herself the liability of her old father to serve in the wars. These instances show with what filial instincts girls of old were imbued. At the present time, too, the treasurer apprehends, there is no lack of daughters equally ready to sacrifice themselves to their parents, or to render the names of their family as illustrious by filial acts of devotion. Such being the case, how comes it that the female infant is looked upon as an enemy from the moment of its birth, and no sooner enters the world than it is consigned to the nearest pool of water? Certainly, there are parents who entertain an affection for their female infants and rear them up, but such number scarcely 20 or 30 per cent.

"The reasons are either (1) that the child is thrown away in disgust because the parents have too many children already; or (2) that it is drowned from sheer chagrin at having begotten none but females, or from apprehension that the mother will not conceive again readily enough if she has to suckle the child; or, lastly, in the fear that the poverty of the family will make it difficult to devote the milk to her own child, when the mother might otherwise hire herself out as wetnurse.

"Now all these are the most stupid of reasons. People seem to be ignorant of the fact that no men are born from heaven without some share of its blessings, and that hunger, cold, or bodily comfort are matters of predestination: so also with sons and heirs, which are even in a greater degree dependent upon the destiny of heaven, and cannot be forcibly coaxed out of it. All that those have to do who are unable through poverty to feed their children is to send them to the Foundling Hospital, where they will be reared up until they become women and wives, and where they will always be sure of enjoying a natural lifetime. With regard to the question of money or no money in the bridal casket, means or no means of bringing up a family, why the bare necessities of life for such children in the shape of the coarsest gown and head-gear do not cost much. There are cases enough of poor lads not being able to find a wife all their lives long, but the treasurer has yet to hear of a poor girl who cannot find a husband, so that there is even less cause for anxiety on that score. But there is another way of looking at it. Heaven's retribution is sure, and cases are common where repeated female births have followed those when the infants have been drowned; that is, man loves to slay what heaven loves to beget, and those perish who set themselves against heaven, as those die who take human life. Also they are haunted by the wraiths of the murdered children, and thus not only fail to hasten the birth of a male child, but run a risk of making victims of themselves by their behaviour. The late Governor, hearing that this wicked custom was rife in Hupei, set forth the law some time

ago in severe prohibitory proclamations; notwithstanding this, many poor districts and out-of-the-way places will not allow themselves to see what is right, but obstinately cling to their old delusion.

"Hia Chien-yin, a graduate from Kianghia, and others have lately petitioned that a proclamation be issued once more prohibiting this practice in strong terms. The treasurer has now to issue this prohibitory proclamation, for the information and instruction of the people and soldiery of the whole province; 'Wherefore you are now required and requested to acquaint yourselves all, that male and female infants being of your own flesh and blood, you may be visited by some monstrous calamity if you rear only the male and drown the female children. Let all henceforth start up from their delusive lethargy, and exhort their neighbours to eschew this dreadful abomination; let them cause their families and neighbours to become alive to its terrible nature, and with one will and consent wrest themselves from under its pernicious influence. If these exhortations are looked upon any more as mere formal words, and if any people with conscious wickedness neglect to turn over a new leaf, they will be punished (but with one degree of additional severity) under the law providing for the punishment of wilful homicide of children and grandchildren. Relatives living with such offenders and neglecting to rescue the children, or deliberately inciting the parents to drown them, will also be severely dealt with.

"Beware and obey! Beware!"

### THE RIGHTS OF WOMEN.

The following letter appeared in the "Spectator" a few weeks ago:—

Sir,—The words which I have just written at the head of this letter are as disagreeable to me as any words can be. I am annoyed by the agitation and controversy called forth on this subject, indifferent to many of the claims made, and antagonistic to most of the so-called champions of women's rights. But still I am a woman, and I begin to be weary of the ceaseless impertinences which your contemporaries think it right and in good taste to level at all women, because they have, or think they have, fit cause of objection against a few. The leading article in the *Pall Mall Gazette* for Wednesday, 4th of March, has just struck me, a perfectly inoffensive woman, who never, so far as I am aware, did anything or said anything to justify the insolent generalising of the journalist, with a sense of injury which I am sure many women will share, though self-respect and unwillingness to identify themselves with the rampant advocates of universal equality keep them silent. The subject of the article I refer to is "The Women's Whiskey War," and this strange crusade is quoted as an instance of what is likely to occur, should a "Women's Disabilities' Removal Bill" be passed in England, or, as the writer in the *Pall Mall Gazette* prefers to put it, "a fair illustration of the sort of effects which would be produced if women in general were taught to believe that the old notions of female modesty and decorum were all nonsense." The "women's whiskey war" is, he tells us, "a typical specimen of the sort of forces with which our women's-rights agitators are playing. Turn women into politicians, and they become at once violent and passionate," he goes on; "they see an evil, they determine to put it down, without the least respect for the rights or property of others;" and he proceeds to imagine the likely case of "women mobbing a man for not going to church, or for going to what they regard as the wrong church." Now may I ask upon what ground an assumption so sweeping and so injurious is founded? The

"women's whiskey war" is not more wonderful as a specimen of human eccentricity than are some other social phenomena exhibited to the world by men in America, but nobody so far as I am aware, has ever supposed that the adaptation of American institutions to English use would instantly establish among us the reign of Judge Lynch and the bowie-knife. Upon what ground do writers go who thus assume women to be actuated by one mad, general impulse, and incapable of being moved by ordinary human sentiments, public opinion, and all the limitations of feeling and action common to the race to which, I presume, we belong as much as men do? Is it really the opinion of some men that women are a dangerous revolutionary sect, only to be kept from turning the world upside down by strenuous repression? Or if this is not the common opinion, why should good writers and journalists of the higher class give such frequent expression to the sentiment? I can understand the virulence of the social assaults upon women in another of your contemporaries more easily, for they are a profitable branch of trade, highly attractive to the assailed as well as the assailants, and therefore carry with them a comprehensible advantage. But I am at a loss to know what good can come of these injurious generalisations, which are so very common, and which can be only founded on theory, since they have no facts to rest upon,—women, as yet, never having had it in their power, if it had been their will, to act in the manner which their critics take for granted. Why should we, I repeat, women, who do nothing to subject ourselves to impertinent remark, be thus publicly and generally insulted, because there are foolish women in the world, as there are, Heaven knows, foolish men enough to match them? Is it a high sense of masculine superiority, or good taste on the part of the stronger, or that fine feeling of justice which men, we are told, possess so much more generally than women, which dictates this treatment? It has never occurred to me personally to wish for a vote, nor do I consider it a sublime privilege to assist infinitesimally in deciding whether a very common-place man on the Liberal side, or a man a little worse than common-place on the Conservative, should represent the little borough in which I live, but I confess that my patience begins to be exhausted by this hot railing against my "side." Why should we women be insulted in the mass, and our sons taught to despise us? We take the railing with much outward patience, not caring to identify ourselves with any "shrieking sisterhood," but if you think we like it, you are infinitely mistaken; and what I want to know is, on what principle this mode of treating the subject is adopted? Is it to be taken as evidence of a wide and universal contempt and dislike on the part of men for their mothers, wives, sisters, and daughters? I am very loath to suppose such a general feeling possible, and it would be a very sad thing for society if it were so; but if not this, what is the reason of it? It may be the mere expression of a manly superiority so far beyond question that it is no longer necessary to prove it; but it sounds very much more like the shrill scolding of a counsel who has ceased to believe in his cause, and who feels (as we have seen in a recent case) general and sweeping denunciation to be as good a way as any of making up for the absence of evidence. Such vituperation is called "womanish" in ordinary phraseology. May I suggest that it is as little dignified as it is generous? I for one, am so weary of being abused, and set down as an impersonation of absolute folly, inconsideration, and unreason, that I begin to ask myself whether the theories of Mr. John Stuart Mill on the subject are really so fantastic and contradictory to experience as I once thought them. They can scarcely be more so than are the assumptions on the other side.—I am, Sir, &c.,

M.

PETITIONS.

WOMEN'S DISABILITIES BILL.—IN FAVOUR.

June 2. Members of the Lincoln United Degree Temple (No. 105) LINCOLN (Mr. Seely) ...	37
Inhabitants of DUBLIN (Colonel Taylor) ...	112
— MAYO (Colonel Taylor) ...	103
Female Inhabitants of DUBLIN (Colonel Taylor) ...	120
Inhabitants of MEATH (Colonel Taylor) ...	55
— LEEDS (Mr. Tennant) ...	264
4. Magistrates and Members of the Town Council, ARBROATH (Mr. Baxter) ...	Seal.
Female Inhabitants of MANCHESTER (Sir Thos. Bazley) ...	364
— (Sir Thomas Bazley) ...	327
— (Sir Thomas Bazley) ...	668
— (Sir Thomas Bazley) ...	523
— (Mr. Birley) ...	673
Inhabitants of BIRMINGHAM (Mr. John Bright) ...	455
— SOUTHSEA and PORTSMOUTH (Mr. Bruce) ...	900
— New Cross Ward, MANCHESTER (Mr. Callender) ...	256
— MANCHESTER (Mr. Callender) ...	325
— ALFORD, in the county of Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) ...	104
— HIGHTGATE (Mr. Coope) ...	764
— BELFAST (Mr. Corry) ...	191
— OCKBROOK, and other places, in the county of Derby (Mr. Evans) ...	25
— HILLTOWN, and other places, in the county of Louth (Mr. Forsyth) ...	48
— PENGE, and other places (Mr. Forsyth) ...	107
— CROYDON (Mr. Grantham) ...	204
— BRISTOL (Mr. Kirkman Hodgson) ...	177
— TAUNTON (Sir Henry James) ...	300
— FROME (Sir Massey Lopes) ...	180
— (Sir Massey Lopes) ...	151
— LOCHGILFHEAD, in public meeting assembled; J. Somerville, chairman (Marquis of Lorne) ...	1
— WIGTON, in the county of Cumberland, in public meeting assembled; B. Wilkinson, chairman (Mr. M'Laren) ...	1
— CANTERBURY (Mr. Majendie) ...	447
— AUCHTERARDER (Sir William Maxwell) ...	69
— DUNBLANE (Sir William Maxwell) ...	110
— ASTON MANOR, in the county of Warwick (Mr. Nevedgate) ...	799
— WESTMINSTER (Mr. William Smith) ...	757
— (Mr. William Smith) ...	648
Members of the Independent Order of Good Templars, GALASHIELS (Mr. Trevelyan) ...	15
— Pride of the Border Lodge of Good Templars (Mr. Trevelyan) ...	8
— Star of Peace Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, GALASHIELS (Mr. Trevelyan) ...	10
— ALEXANDER COMBAT LODGE (Mr. Trevelyan) ...	14
— Inhabitants of PORTADOWN (Mr. Verner) ...	48
— Members of the Always Hope Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, MACCLESFIELD ...	6
— May Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, HARROGATE ...	22
5. Inhabitants of ILFRACOMBE (Sir Thomas Dyke Acland) ...	107
— WANDSWORTH (Mr. Attorney-General) ...	159
— New Cross Ward, MANCHESTER (Mr. Birley) ...	748
— BATH (Major Bousfield) ...	26
— Female Inhabitants of BATH (Major Bousfield) ...	120
— Inhabitants of MANCHESTER (Mr. Callender) ...	1,030
— SALFORD (Mr. Cawley) ...	471
— Female Inhabitants of PENDLETON (Mr. Cawley) ...	576
— Inhabitants of BURGH LE MARSH, in the county of Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) ...	65

June 5. JANET M'LAREN and another (Mr. Cowan) ...	2
— MARGARET INGLIS (Mr. Cowan) ...	1
— ANGES LILLIE (Mr. Cowan) ...	1
— ANGES GUNION (Mr. Cowan) ...	1
— CATHERINE MUIR (Mr. Cowan) ...	1
— JESSIE BARTHOLOMEW (Mr. Cowan) ...	1
— JANET H. B. YOUNG (Mr. Cowan) ...	1
— CHRISTINA BARTHOLOMEW (Mr. Cowan) ...	1
— LYDIA GREGORY (Mr. Cowan) ...	1
— AGNES LAWRENCE (Mr. Cowan) ...	1
— HELEN STURROCH (Mr. Cowan) ...	1
— Inhabitants of HALTON LEA GATE, in the county of Northumberland, in public meeting assembled; John Palmer, chairman (Mr. Cowan) ...	1
— HALTWHISTLE, in the county of Northumberland, in public meeting assembled; John F. Graham, chairman, (Mr. Cowan) ...	1
— BERKHAMPSTEAD (Mr. Couper) ...	57
— PETERHEAD (Mr. Grant Duff) ...	82
— CUPAR (Mr. Ellice) ...	199
— ISABELLA SCOTT (Mr. Macgregor) ...	1
— ANN IRELAND (Mr. Macgregor) ...	1
— Inhabitants of WIGTON, in the county of Cumberland (Mr. Macgregor) ...	56
— LEITH (Mr. Macgregor) ...	248
— HALTWHISTLE (Mr. Macgregor) ...	148
— EDINBURGH, in public meeting assembled; J. Crichton, chairman (Mr. M'Laren) ...	1
— STRANRAER (Mr. M'Laren) ...	802
— EDINBURGH (Mr. M'Laren) ...	950
— CLONMEL, in public meeting assembled; Edward Cantwell, mayor, chairman (Mr. Moore) ...	1
— ANNAN (Mr. Ernest Noel) ...	135
— LONGFORD (Mr. O'Clery) ...	112
— GALWAY (Mr. O'Sullivan) ...	24
— KILKENNY (Mr. O'Sullivan) ...	130
— CORK (Mr. Ronayne) ...	50
— (Mr. Ronayne) ...	13
— Members of the Burgh Lifeboat Lodge of Good Templars, BURGH LE MARSH, in the county of Lincoln (Mr. Edward Stanhope) ...	11
— Inhabitants of GALASHIELS (Mr. Trevelyan) ...	203
— Members of the Fishermen's Rescue Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, BROUGHTY FERRY; John Scott, worthy chief templar (Mr. Yeaman) ...	1
8. Inhabitants of LOUTH, in the county of Lincoln (Sir John Astley) ...	278
— CARNOSTIE (Mr. James Barclay) ...	109
— MANCHESTER (Mr. Callender) ...	525
— Female Inhabitants of PENDLETON (Mr. Cawley) ...	438
— SALFORD (Mr. Charley) ...	636
— Inhabitants of PENDLETON (Mr. Charley) ...	387
— Female Inhabitants of SALFORD (Mr. Charley) ...	401
— OPENSHAW (Mr. Algernon Egerton) ...	379
— NEWBURGH, in the county of Northumberland (Lord Estlington) ...	42
— NEWBROUGH, in the county of Northumberland, in public meeting assembled; J. Westgate Hetherington, chairman (Lord Estlington) ...	1
— HORSHAM, in the county of Sussex (Mr. Forsyth) ...	13
— CIRENCESTER (Sir Francis Goldsmid) ...	486
— HARROW, in public meeting assembled; A. Treslove Cox, chairman (Lord George Hamilton) ...	1
— HORFIELD (Mr. Morley) ...	184
— LANGSIDE (Colonel Mure) ...	65
— CROSSHILL (Colonel Mure) ...	408
— CLARE (Mr. O'Conor) ...	100

June 8. Female Inhabitants of SLIGO (The O'Conor Don) ...	102
— QUEEN'S COUNTY, Ireland (The O'Conor Don) ...	102
— PETERSHAM (Sir Henry Peek) ...	34
— PUTNEY (Sir Henry Peek) ...	50
— ROCHDALE (Mr. Potter) ...	3,048
— STALYBRIDGE and DUKINFIELD (Mr. Sidebottom) ...	864
— HUNSLET (Mr. Tennant) ...	191
— HAWICK (Mr. Trevelyan) ...	257
— GLOUCESTER (Mr. Wait) ...	500
9. Inhabitants of Bradford and Openshaw, in the county of Lancaster (Sir Thos. Bazley) ...	251
— Female Inhabitants of Oxford Ward, MANCHESTER (Sir Thomas Bazley) ...	511
— MANCHESTER (Mr. Birley) ...	942
— Inhabitants of Dublin (Mr. Maurice Brooks) ...	406
— SALFORD (Mr. Cawley) ...	299
— LENZIE (Sir Thomas Colebrooke) ...	122
— CARSTAIRS (Sir Thomas Colebrooke) ...	142
— EDINBURGH (Mr. Cowan) ...	406
— BELFAST (Mr. Crawford) ...	48
— HACKNEY (Mr. Fawcett) ...	1,423
— CHARLES GREGORY and others (Mr. Forsyth) ...	39
— ELIZABETH ANN PRICE and others (Mr. Forsyth) ...	59
— Inhabitants of DAVENTRY (Mr. Forsyth) ...	12
— EASTVALE (Mr. Forsyth) ...	115
— CHIPPENHAM (Mr. Goldney) ...	158
— GLASTHULE, in the county of Dublin (Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton) ...	20
— WESTMEATH (Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton) ...	104
— BOOTERSTOWN (Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton) ...	30
— LOUTH (Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton) ...	113
— DUBLIN (Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton) ...	70
— (Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton) ...	80
— Members of the Liberal Association, BLUEPITS (Mr. Hardeastle) ...	46
— Inhabitants of THAME (Mr. Henley) ...	52
— DALSTON and HACKNEY (Mr. John Holms) ...	986
— PAISLEY (Mr. William Holms) ...	177
— PECKHAM (Sir James Lawrence) ...	50
— ELIZABETH MARY WALSH, Sandycore, Dublin County (Mr. O'Sullivan) ...	1
— MARIA SHAW, Dublin (Mr. O'Sullivan) ...	1
— MARTHA SINNOTT, Williamstown, Dublin (Mr. O'Sullivan) ...	1
— Members of the Spotland Liberal Association, ROCHDALE (Mr. Potter) ...	37
— Castlemere Lodge of Good Templars, ROCHDALE (Mr. Potter) ...	52
— Wesley Lodge of Good Templars, ROCHDALE (Mr. Potter) ...	52
— Star of Freedom Lodge of Good Templars, ROCHDALE (Mr. Potter) ...	52
— Liberal Association, Alley Lower Place, ROCHDALE (Mr. Potter) ...	30
— Bright Star Lodge of Good Templars, ROCHDALE (Mr. Potter) ...	47
— Hamer Liberal Association, ROCHDALE (Mr. Potter) ...	48
— Inhabitants of NORTH BOW and MILE END (Mr. Ritchie) ...	1,682
— BRIGHTON (General Shute) ...	1,351
— WOLVERHAMPTON (Mr. Weguelin) ...	40
— BLACKBURN ...	26
10. BATHAMPTON (Major Allen) ...	39
— WESTON (Major Allen) ...	175
— Members of the Tay Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, DUNDEE; John Johnston, worthy chief templar, and another (Sir Robert Anstruther) ...	2
— Inhabitants of Oxford Ward, MANCHESTER (Mr. Birley) ...	332
— PORTSEA and LANDPORT (Mr. Bruce) ...	1,088
— DORCHESTER, in public meeting assembled; Henry Locke, chairman (Mr. Brymer) ...	1

¶ June 10. Inhabitants of DORCHESTER (Mr. Brymer) ... 412  
 ¶ — LEEDS (Mr. Carter) ... 301  
 ¶ — SHOREHAM (Mr. Stephen Cave) ... 94  
 ¶ — Female Inhabitants of IPSWICH (Mr. Cobbold) ... 248  
 ¶ — Inhabitants of GARTSHERRIE (Sir Thomas Colebrooke) ... 117  
 ¶ — BELFAST (Mr. James Corry) ... 123  
 ¶ — WEST COANWOOD, in the county of Northumberland, in meeting assembled; John Newton, chairman (Mr. Cowan) ... 1  
 ¶ — BRISTOL (Mr. Grant Duff) ... 125  
 ¶ — Members of the United Compsall Lodge of Good Templars, MANCHESTER (Mr. Algernon Egerton) ... 12  
 ¶ — Inhabitants of Blackley, MANCHESTER (Mr. Algernon Egerton) ... 44  
 ¶ — E. R. CANNING and others (Mr. Forsyth) ... 20  
 ¶ — SUSAN JACKSON, Great Britain Street, Dublin (Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton) ... 1  
 ¶ — ANNE KAVANAGH, Kingstown, Dublin (Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton) ... 1  
 ¶ — ELIZA KELLY, Glashule, in the county of Dublin (Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton) ... 1  
 ¶ — Inhabitants of BEWDLEY (Mr. Charles Harrison) ... 54  
 ¶ — Members of the Saint John's Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars in DUNDEE; David McKenzie, worthy chief templar (Mr. Edward Jenkins) ... 1  
 ¶ — Inhabitants of ONAGH, in the county of Tyrone (Mr. Mucartney) ... 47  
 ¶ — SAINT JOHN'S WOOD (Mr. M'Laren) ... 43  
 ¶ — DALBEATTIE (Mr. Maitland) ... 34  
 ¶ — INVERGORDON, in public meeting assembled; James MacKillean, chairman (Mr. Matheson) ... 1  
 ¶ — LOCHFOOT and other places (Mr. Maitland) ... 150  
 ¶ — BLAIRGOWRIE (Sir William Maxwell) ... 75  
 ¶ — TAVISTOCK (Lord Arthur Russell) ... 123  
 ¶ — WAKEFIELD (Mr. Sanderson) ... 133  
 ¶ — CAMBRIDGE (Mr. Smollett) ... 65  
 ¶ — Female Inhabitants of DALKEY, in the county of Dublin (Mr. Sullivan) ... 12  
 ¶ — Inhabitants of DUBLIN (Mr. Sullivan) ... 101  
 ¶ — BLACKROCK, in the county of Dublin (Mr. Sullivan) ... 110  
 ¶ — PENYDARRAN (Mr. Talbot) ... 75  
 ¶ — MERTHYR (Mr. Talbot) ... 50  
 ¶ — Members of the Congregation of Libanus Chapel, DOWLAIS (Mr. Talbot) ... 72  
 ¶ — Members of the BROUGHTY FERRY Lodge of Good Templars, in meeting assembled; Peter Crystal, worthy chief templar (Mr. Yeaman) ... 1  
 ¶ — 11. Inhabitants of BATHEASTON (Major Bousfield) ... 149  
 ¶ — BATHFORD (Major Bousfield) ... 55  
 ¶ — HENDON (Mr. Coope) ... 61  
 ¶ — Members of the Loyal Westminster Lodge of Good Templars, CHESTER (Mr. Dodson) ... 24  
 ¶ — Inhabitants of Slateford, MID LOTHIAN (Earl of Dalkeith) ... 72  
 ¶ — LEITRIM (The O'Conor Don) ... 103  
 ¶ — WICKLOW (The O'Conor Don) ... 102  
 ¶ — ROSCOMMON (The O'Conor Don) ... 112  
 ¶ — KERRY (The O'Conor Don) ... 107  
 ¶ — Members of the Liberal Association, ROCHDALE (Mr. Potter) ... 40  
 ¶ — Inhabitants of SEATON CAREW (Mr. Richardson) ... 102  
 ¶ — Members of the Alpha Lodge of Good Templars, ALNWICK (Mr. Ridley) ... 48  
 ¶ — Inhabitants of LIMERICK and KNOCK (Mr. Synan) ... 48  
 ¶ — JOHN MILLER, J.P., and others (Sir Richard Wallace) ... 73  
 ¶ — 12. Inhabitants of DUNMORE, in the county of Ayr (Colonel Alexander) ... 127  
 ¶ — WESTON-SUPER-MARE (Major Allen) ... 150  
 ¶ — NEWPORT (Mr. Cordes) ... 324

¶ June 12. Inhabitants of EDINBURGH (Mr. Cowan) ... 394  
 ¶ — AYR (Sir William Cuninghame) ... 361  
 ¶ — Members of the MELROSE ABBEY Lodge of Good Templars, J. A. Dewar, worthy chief templar, and others (Sir George Douglas) ... 3  
 ¶ — Inhabitants of MELROSE (Sir George Douglas) ... 116  
 ¶ — CHIPPENHAM (Mr. Estcourt) ... 135  
 ¶ — MALMESBURY (Mr. Estcourt) ... 132  
 ¶ — CALNE, in the county of Wilts (Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice) ... 39  
 ¶ — MARYLEBONE (Mr. Forsyth) ... 64  
 ¶ — (Mr. Forsyth) ... 128  
 ¶ — GREENWICH (Mr. Wm. Ewart Gladstone) ... 351  
 ¶ — WOOLWICH (Mr. William Ewart Gladstone) ... 294  
 ¶ — DUBLIN (Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton) ... 106  
 ¶ — (Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton) ... 120  
 ¶ — ELIZABETH WARD, Thomas Street, Dublin (Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton) ... 1  
 ¶ — CATHERINE ANDREWS, Blackrock (Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton) ... 1  
 ¶ — Inhabitants of BATH (Mr. Hayter) ... 44  
 ¶ — Members of the Life Buoy Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, LEITH; J. Allam, worthy chief templar, and another (Mr. Macgregor) ... 2  
 ¶ — NORAH M'DERMOTT, Tulla, in the county of Clare (Mr. O'Sullivan) ... 1  
 ¶ — MARTHA KERR, Williamstown, Dublin (Mr. O'Sullivan) ... 1  
 ¶ — ELIZABETH WALSH, Sandycove, in the county of Dublin (Mr. O'Sullivan) ... 1  
 ¶ — JANE DOYLE, Roebuck, in the county of Dublin (Mr. O'Sullivan) ... 1  
 ¶ — EMILY REDDY, Sandymount, in the county of Dublin (Mr. O'Sullivan) ... 1  
 ¶ — Inhabitants of CLOUTARF (Mr. O'Sullivan) ... 52  
 ¶ — Attendants at a public meeting assembled at BRIMS HALL; Alexander Corner, chairman (Mr. Pender) ... 1  
 ¶ — Inhabitants of ROCHDALE (Mr. Potter) ... 726  
 ¶ — MALMESBURY (Mr. Powell) ... 104  
 ¶ — BURNTISLAND (Mr. Reed) ... 46  
 ¶ — KILDARE (Colonel Taylor) ... 122  
 ¶ — DUBLIN (Colonel Taylor) ... 203  
 ¶ — GEASHILL and other places, King's County (Colonel Taylor) ... 107  
 ¶ — BLACKROCK (Colonel Taylor) ... 303  
 ¶ — SARAH MAGUIRE, Westland Row, Dublin (Colonel Taylor) ... 1  
 ¶ — ANNE REDMOND, Kings Town, in the county of Dublin (Colonel Taylor) ... 1  
 ¶ — ELIZABETH WRIGHT, Summer Hill, Dublin (Colonel Taylor) ... 1  
 ¶ — Women of DUBLIN (Colonel Taylor) ... 65  
 ¶ — TIPPERARY (Colonel Taylor) ... 44  
 ¶ — BLACKROCK (Colonel Taylor) ... 114  
 ¶ — BRAY (Colonel Taylor) ... 26  
 ¶ — BLACKROCK (Colonel Taylor) ... 22  
 ¶ — DUBLIN (Colonel Taylor) ... 112  
 ¶ — Inhabitants of DEPTFORD ... 302  
 ¶ — GREENWICH ... 427  
 ¶ — STROMNESS, in public meeting assembled; James Spence, chairman ... 1  
 ¶ — 15. — SLIGO and other places (Mr. O'Conor) ... 102  
 ¶ — RATHDOWNNEY, in the Queen's County (Mr. O'Conor) ... 102  
 ¶ — CHELTENHAM (Sir Michael Hicks Beach) ... 2  
 ¶ — SOUTHWICK (Sir Percy Burrell) ... 16  
 ¶ — in public meeting assembled; Robt. Penney, chairman (Sir P. Burrell) ... 1  
 ¶ — BRADFORD (Mr. Callender) ... 227  
 ¶ — Saint James's Ward, MANCHESTER (Mr. Callender) ... 235  
 ¶ — Women of Saint James's Ward, MANCHESTER (Mr. Callender) ... 364

¶ June 15. Women of BRADFORD (Mr. Callender) ... 380  
 ¶ — Inhabitants of LEEDS (Mr. Carter) ... 329  
 ¶ — SALFORD (Mr. Cawley) ... 262  
 ¶ — PENDLETON (Mr. Cawley) ... 182  
 ¶ — KELSO (Sir George Douglas) ... 215  
 ¶ — SAINT PANCRAS Board of Guardians (Mr. Forsyth) ... 16  
 ¶ — E. MARTIN, Baggot-street, Dublin (Sir Arthur Guinness) ... 1  
 ¶ — Women of CARLOW (Sir Arthur Guinness) ... 44  
 ¶ — BOOTERSTOWN (Sir Arthur Guinness) ... 53  
 ¶ — MARY CONNOLLY, Drumcondra, in the county of Dublin (Sir Arthur Guinness) ... 1  
 ¶ — ANNA MOORE, Moore-street, Dublin (Sir Arthur Guinness) ... 1  
 ¶ — Inhabitants of DALKEY, Dublin (Sir Arthur Guinness) ... 64  
 ¶ — KINGSTOWN, in the county of Dublin (Sir Arthur Guinness) ... 140  
 ¶ — DUBLIN (Sir Arthur Guinness) ... 130  
 ¶ — (Sir Arthur Guinness) ... 103  
 ¶ — VALENTIA (Mr. Herbert) ... 8  
 ¶ — BRISTOL (Mr. Kirkman Hodgson) ... 340  
 ¶ — Members of the District Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, DUNDEE; Peter Matthews, president, and others (Mr. Edward Jenkins) ... 3  
 ¶ — Women of BELFAST (Mr. Johnston) ... 48  
 ¶ — Inhabitants of BATH (Mr. Kinnaird) ... 191  
 ¶ — CLIFTON (Mr. Morley) ... 362  
 ¶ — Assistant Masters of Clifton College, BRISTOL, (Mr. Morley) ... 14  
 ¶ — Inhabitants of BARRHEAD (Colonel Mure) ... 377  
 ¶ — Members of the Flower of Nithsdale and Life Guard Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, DUMFRIES (Mr. Ernest Noel) ... 8  
 ¶ — Saint Michael's Lodge of Free Templars, DUMFRIES; James H. Brown, worthy master, and others (Mr. Ernest Noel) ... 14  
 ¶ — QUEEN OF THE SOUTH Lodge of Free Templars of St. John; James Craig, worthy master, and another (Mr. Ernest Noel) ... 2  
 ¶ — Women of SLIGO, and others (Mr. O'Conor) ... 50  
 ¶ — ELLEN DONNELLY, Hacketstown, in the county of Carlow (Mr. O'Conor) ... 1  
 ¶ — Inhabitants of CARRICK ON SHANNON (Mr. O'Conor) ... 16  
 ¶ — DUBLIN (Mr. O'Conor) ... 86  
 ¶ — (Mr. O'Sullivan) ... 80  
 ¶ — CARSHALTON, in the county of Surrey (Sir Henry Peek) ... 101  
 ¶ — SOUTHAMPTON (Sir Frederick Perkins) ... 500  
 ¶ — IPSWICH ... 381  
 ¶ — 16. — GLENLUCE (Mr. Agnew) ... 496  
 ¶ — ANSTRUTHER (Sir Robert Anstruther) ... 67  
 ¶ — DYSART (Sir Robert Anstruther) ... 44  
 ¶ — BRIGHTON (Mr. Ashbury) ... 1,810  
 ¶ — WESTON-SUPER-MARE (Mr. Richd. Bright) ... 167  
 ¶ — Members of the Aim at Right Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, HYDE, in the county of Chester (Mr. Cunliffe Brooks) ... 23  
 ¶ — Inhabitants of MARYLEBONE and other places (Mr. Forsyth) ... 746  
 ¶ — SOUTHAMPTON (Mr. Gurney) ... 308  
 ¶ — A. TARRY and others (Mr. Heygate) ... 75  
 ¶ — AGNES WATT, and others (Mr. William Holms) ... 15  
 ¶ — Members of the Christopher North Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, PAISLEY (Mr. William Holms) ... 19  
 ¶ — John Dunlop Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars PAISLEY (Mr. William Holms) ... 46

¶ June 16. Members of Hope of Newhaven Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, NEWHAVEN; Jas. Thompson, worthy chief Templar, and another (Mr. Macgregor) ... 2  
 ¶ — Rescue Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, LEITH; G. Ballantyne, worthy chief templar, and another (Mr. Macgregor) ... 2  
 ¶ — LIFE BOAT LODGE of the Independent Order of Good Templars; Gilbert Auber, worthy chief templar, and another (Mr. Macgregor) ... 2  
 ¶ — Inhabitants of LEICESTER (Mr. Alex. M'Arthur) ... 125  
 ¶ — DUMFRIES (Mr. Ernest Noel) ... 35  
 ¶ — STOKENCHURCH (Colonel North) ... 103  
 ¶ — BANTRY (Mr. O'Clery) ... 108  
 ¶ — DUBLIN (Mr. O'Clery) ... 102  
 ¶ — WEXFORD (Mr. O'Clery) ... 100  
 ¶ — WESTMEATH, and other places (Mr. O'Clery) ... 115  
 ¶ — DUBLIN (Mr. O'Clery) ... 130  
 ¶ — C. D. ROBERTSON, St. James's Place, Blackrock (Mr. O'Clery) ... 1  
 ¶ — MARY J. FARRELL, Glashule, in the county of Dublin (Mr. O'Clery) ... 1  
 ¶ — MARGARET REYNOLDS, Kingstown, in the county of Dublin (Mr. O'Clery) ... 1  
 ¶ — ANNE WHITEHEAD, Dublin (Mr. O'Clery) ... 1  
 ¶ — ELIZABETH SHERIN, George Street, Dublin (Mr. O'Clery) ... 1  
 ¶ — Women of BLACKROCK (Mr. O'Clery) ... 56  
 ¶ — WILLIAMSTOWN (Mr. O'Clery) ... 13  
 ¶ — WEXFORD (Mr. O'Clery) ... 30  
 ¶ — ROSCOMMON and other places (Mr. O'Clery) ... 50  
 ¶ — CLARE (Mr. O'Clery) ... 56  
 ¶ — WICKLOW (Mr. O'Clery) ... 102  
 ¶ — Members of the Old Shildon Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, in the county of DURHAM (Mr. Pease) ... 54  
 ¶ — MARY A. BARKBY and others (Mr. Pell) ... 130  
 ¶ — Inhabitants of TAIN (Mr. Pender) ... 99  
 ¶ — ROCHDALE (Mr. Potter) ... 1,042  
 ¶ — MALMESBURY (Mr. Powell) ... 90  
 ¶ — DONCASTER (Mr. Spencer Stanhope) ... 45  
 ¶ — RATHMINES, in the county of Dublin (Col. Taylor) ... 48  
 ¶ — DUBLIN (Colonel Taylor) ... 114  
 ¶ — (Colonel Taylor) ... 136  
 ¶ — (Colonel Taylor) ... 103  
 ¶ — BLACKROCK (Colonel Taylor) ... 50  
 ¶ — MARY A. FITZSIMON, Richmond, Dublin (Col. Taylor) ... 1  
 ¶ — MARY BRENNAN, Kingstown, in the county of Dublin (Colonel Taylor) ... 1  
 ¶ — MARIA FALLON, Sandymount, in the county of Dublin (Colonel Taylor) ... 1  
 ¶ — Inhabitants of STOUBRIDGE (Mr. Walker) ... 81  
 ¶ — BROADWAY and other places, in the county of Worcester (Mr. Walker) ... 24  
 ¶ — CROYDON (Mr. Watney) ... 67  
 ¶ — HEAPHAM, in the county of Lincoln (Mr. Winn) ... 8  
 ¶ — 15. — PERTH (Mr. Kinnaird) ... 191  
 ¶ — 17. — WEDNESBURY, in public meeting assembled; R. B. Feast, chairman (Mr. Brogden) ... 1  
 ¶ — PENDLETON (Mr. Charley) ... 170  
 ¶ — Women of PENDLETON (Mr. Charley) ... 433  
 ¶ — SALFORD (Mr. Charley) ... 346  
 ¶ — Members of the Menai Lodge of Good Templars, LLANDYSILLO (Mr. Richard Davies) ... 54  
 ¶ — Inhabitants of CRICKLADE, in the county of Wilts (Mr. Estcourt) ... 98  
 ¶ — BLACKBURN (Mr. Forsyth) ... 326  
 ¶ — (Mr. Forsyth) ... 261  
 ¶ — BRISTOL (Mr. Kirkman Hodgson) ... 564

¶	June 17. Inhabitants of Redcliffe, BRISTOL ( <i>Mr. Kirkman Hodgson</i> ) ... ..	446
¶	— HACKNEY, ( <i>Mr. John Holms</i> ) ... ..	2,223
¶	— PAISLEY ( <i>Mr. William Holms</i> ) ... ..	331
¶	— — ( <i>Mr. William Holms</i> ) ... ..	205
¶	— — ( <i>Mr. William Holms</i> ) ... ..	288
¶	MARY POLLOCK, Paisley ( <i>Mr. William Holms</i> ) ... ..	1
¶	E. WYLIE, Paisley ( <i>Mr. William Holms</i> ) ... ..	1
¶	ANNABELLA CUNNINGHAME, Paisley ( <i>Mr. William Holms</i> ) ... ..	1
¶	JANET CALDWELL, Paisley ( <i>Mr. William Holms</i> ) ... ..	1
¶	Inhabitants of LYMINGTON, in the county of Hants, in public meeting assembled; Henry Dorman, chairman ( <i>Colonel Kemard</i> ) ... ..	1
¶	— LYMINGTON, in the county of Hants ( <i>Colonel Kemard</i> ) ... ..	40
¶	— MIDDLETON, Manchester ( <i>Mr. Melly</i> ) ... ..	48
¶	— WEST LINTON and MOUNTAIN CROSS ( <i>Sir George Montgomery</i> ) ... ..	73
¶	CATHERINE O'BRIEN, Dundrum ( <i>Mr. Moore</i> ) ... ..	1
¶	Inhabitants of FALKIRK ( <i>Mr. Ramsay</i> ) ... ..	295
¶	Women of WESTMINSTER ( <i>Mr. William Smith</i> ) ... ..	200
¶	Inhabitants of WESTMINSTER ( <i>Mr. William Smith</i> ) ... ..	1,372
¶	— LEICESTER ( <i>Mr. Peter Taylor</i> ) ... ..	128
¶	— HOLBECK ( <i>Mr. Wheelhouse</i> ) ... ..	317
¶	— LOUTH ( <i>Mr. Winn</i> ) ... ..	344
¶	18. ELIZABETH NIXON, Lochnagar Place, Stranraer ( <i>Mr. Agnew</i> ) ... ..	1
¶	SUSAN ELDER, London Road, Stranraer ( <i>Mr. Agnew</i> ) ... ..	1
¶	ELIZABETH FENWICK, Glenluce ( <i>Mr. Agnew</i> ) ... ..	1
¶	ANNIE WALES, Mill Bank Cottage, Glenluce ( <i>Mr. Agnew</i> ) ... ..	1
¶	MARY M'MASTER, 3, Albany Place, London Road, Stranraer ( <i>Mr. Agnew</i> ) ... ..	1
¶	ELIZABETH WILLIAMS, London Road, Stranraer ( <i>Mr. Agnew</i> ) ... ..	1
¶	MARGARET WATT, London Road, Stranraer ( <i>Mr. Agnew</i> ) ... ..	1
¶	MARGARET M'EWEN, High-street, Leswalt ( <i>Mr. Agnew</i> ) ... ..	1
¶	ANN M'DOWALL, London Road, Stranraer ( <i>Mr. Agnew</i> ) ... ..	1
¶	Inhabitants of BROUGHTY FERRY, in public meeting assembled; George J. A. Kidd, chairman ( <i>Mr. James Barclay</i> ) ... ..	1
¶	— HORNCastle ( <i>Mr. Chaplin</i> ) ... ..	42
¶	— HARROW and ENFIELD ( <i>Mr. Coope</i> ) ... ..	46
¶	— BICKLEY and other places ( <i>Mr. Forsyth</i> ) ... ..	446
¶	— GREAT YARMOUTH ( <i>Mr. Hopwood</i> ) ... ..	52
¶	— THORNHILL, in the county of Dumfries, in public meeting assembled; T. B. Grierson, chairman ( <i>Mr. Johnstone</i> ) ... ..	1
¶	— MAIDSTONE and YALDING ( <i>Sir John Lubbock</i> ) ... ..	461
¶	Women Ratepayers of Maidstone ( <i>Sir John Lubbock</i> ) ... ..	140
¶	Inhabitants of PORTOBELLO ( <i>Mr. Macgregor</i> ) ... ..	28
¶	Members of the Excelsior Club of the Independent Order of Good Templars, LEITH; Gilbert Archer, chief preses ( <i>Mr. Macgregor</i> ) ... ..	1
¶	— Pilot Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, LEITH; John Stewart, worthy chief templar, and another ( <i>Mr. Macgregor</i> ) ... ..	2
¶	Inhabitants of LEICESTER ( <i>Mr. Alexander M'Arthur</i> ) ... ..	184
¶	— LAMBETH and BATTERSEA ( <i>Mr. William M'Arthur</i> ) ... ..	1,649
¶	— LAMBETH ( <i>Mr. William M'Arthur</i> ) ... ..	936
¶	— STRATFORD ( <i>Colonel Makins</i> ) ... ..	986
¶	— — ( <i>Colonel Makins</i> ) ... ..	602
¶	— PLUMSTEAD and neighbourhood ( <i>Mr. Pemberton</i> ) ... ..	169

MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS RECEIVED DURING AUGUST, 1874.

	£	s.	d.
Miss Rigbye ... ..	5	0	0
Mr. Philip Goldschmidt... ..	5	0	0
Rev. S. Alfred Steintal ... ..	5	0	0
Mr. Wm. Mather ... ..	2	0	0
Mrs. Long ... ..	2	0	0
Mr. Abraham Haworth... ..	1	1	0
Lady Julia Lockwood ... ..	1	0	0
Miss Mabel Sharman Crawford ... ..	1	0	0
Miss E. C. Shepherd (Southport) ... ..	1	0	0
Miss Julia Anthony... ..	0	10	0
Miss Stuart ... ..	0	10	0
Miss Hardwick... ..	0	10	0
Mrs. Leech... ..	0	5	0
Mr. John A. Lyon ... ..	0	5	0
Mrs. Woodhead ... ..	0	5	0
Miss Lucy Woodhead ... ..	0	5	0
Mr. H. Woodhead ... ..	0	5	0
Miss A. Wilson... ..	0	5	0
Mr. R. Sutcliffe ... ..	0	5	0
Mrs. R. Sutcliffe ... ..	0	5	0
Mr. Davis ... ..	0	2	6
Mr. Dawson ... ..	0	2	6
Collected by Mr. Brittain ... ..	0	2	3
	£27	0	3

S. ALFRED STEINTAL, Treasurer.

Cheques and Post Office Orders should be made payable to the Treasurer, Rev. S. ALFRED STEINTAL, and may be sent either direct to him at 107, Upper Brook-street; or to the Secretary, Miss BECKER, 28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

Contributions to the funds of the Central Committee of the National Society for Women's Suffrage, 294, Regent Street, London, W., from July 21st, to August 20th, 1874.

	£	s.	d.
Mr. and Mrs. J. P. Thomasson ... ..	50	0	0
Mrs. Harriet Martineau ... ..	1	1	0
Hon. Mrs. Drummond ... ..	0	15	0
Miss Mulholland ... ..	0	10	0
Mrs. Tennant ... ..	0	10	0
Mrs. Rycroft Best ... ..	0	5	0
Rev. A. W. Worthington... ..	0	5	0
Miss Carey ... ..	0	1	0
Madame Foa... ..	0	1	0
Miss Rae ... ..	0	1	0
	£53	9	0

ALFRED W. BENNETT, Treasurer.

PETITIONS TO THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

We earnestly exhort our friends to help the cause by promoting petitions in their several localities. The following is the form recommended:—

To the Honourable the Commons of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of the undersigned

SHEWETH,

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

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable House will pass a measure to remove the Electoral Disabilities of Women. And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.

Written headings will be supplied on application to Miss BECKER, 28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester.